DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 234 TM 840 513

AUTHOR	Peterson, Sarah; And Others
TITLE	Elementary and Junior High Gifted Programs as Seen by Students, Parents and Teachers/Administrators, 1983. RR-47.
INSTITUTION	Mesa Public Schools, AZ. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Mar 83
NOTE	220p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Gifted; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Parent Attitudes; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; School Districts; *Special Education; Student Attitudes; *Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Mesa Public Schools AZ

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of an evaluation of the Mesa Public Schools Gifted/Extended Learning Program. The gifted program offers a one day per week program at 13 sites for qualifying students in grades 3-6 and specific classes for the students at all junior and senior high schools. Attitudinal data were collected for parents, teachers, administrators, and students who participated in these programs 1980-82. The results indicated a strong need for services and/or programs beyond the regular classroom for gifted elementary children. The Mesa program was rated as above average to excellent by a majority of respondents. The current method of implementing the elementary program was the preferred method. The groups surveyed also viewed a number of the process variables in a positive light. It is recommended that no significant changes be made in the elementary program. The junior high program was rated highly by a majority of parents and students; however, less than fifty per cent of teachers and administrators judged the program as excellent or above average. They questioned the motivational factor of the program, the relevance of all activities, and whether students' individual needs were being met in the classroom. Some minor changes in the junior high program are recommended. (BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249234

Elementary and Junior High Gifted Programs As Seen by Students, Parents and Teachers/Administrators
1983

Sarah Peterson
James DeGracie
Judy Rule

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. S. DeGracie
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TM 840 513

DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH & EVALUATION

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Elementary and Junior High Gifted Programs As Seen by Students, Parents and Teachers/Administrators 1983

Sarah Peterson
James DeGracie
Judy Rule

Dr. George N. Smith
Superintendent

Dr. James K. Zaharis
Deputy Superintendent
Educational Services

Dr. James S. DeGracie
Director, Research and Evaluation

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
March 1983

RR-47

FOREWORD

The major function of the Mesa Public Schools Department of Research and Evaluation is to provide information to decision makers. This data should be timely, valid, reliable, accurate, and informative. It should be of sufficient depth, yet concise enough to speak squarely to the issue at hand.

The purpose of this report by the Department of Research and Evaluation was to collect baseline data about the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program. It is hoped that with this collection of information, planning, implementation, and results of program and policies will be even more directed and suited to the variety of needs of the students served by the program.

The major effort in the development of this report was the responsibility of Research and Evaluation, under the direction of Dr. James DeGracie. Ms. Carol Ayabe contributed greatly to the data analysis and presentation. Members of Mesa Parents Association for the Gifted and Talented contributed significantly to the development of the survey instruments and also the processing of several hundred surveys for distributions. Members of the Department of Research and Evaluation, Ms. Shirley Halverson, Ms. Patty Stein, Ms. Judy Hill, Ms. Debbie Hollingsworth, and Ms. Evelyn Winkler, and COE student Joe Cobos, all contributed significant effort in reproduction and preparation of this report for distribution. Ms. Donna Replogle accomplished the extensive typing and editing of this report. Mesa Public Schools Data Processing Department, particularly Donna Dirks and Bill Neiggemann, provided a significant effort in the sample selection. Finally, the cooperation of Ms. Eleanor TeSelle and the Mesa Schools Gifted Study Committee, as well as Mesa teachers and administrators is acknowledged. Their support, guidance, and professional knowledge proved to be invaluable.

Research and Evaluation is a department answering to the Deputy Superintendent, Dr. James Zaharis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODS 5

Survey Development 5

Sampling 10

Data Analysis 13

RESULTS 18

Elementary Gifted Program 18

Junior High Gifted Program 50

SUMMARY 79

Introduction 79

Methods 80

Results 81

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 107

Elementary Program 107

Junior High Program 110

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Ten Most Positive Likert Items on Parent Survey of Elementary Gifted Program 23

Table 2 - Five Most Negative Likert Items on Parent Survey of Elementary Gifted Program 24

Table 3 - Likert Items on Parent Survey of Elementary Gifted Program on Which Elementary and Junior High Parents Differed Significantly. 25

Page

Table 4 - Ten Most Positive Likert Items on Teacher/Administrator Survey of Elementary Gifted Program 35

Table 5 - Five Most Negative Likert Items on Teacher/Administrator Survey of Elementary Gifted Program 36

Table 6 - Likert Items on Teacher/Administrator Survey of Elementary Gifted Program on Which the Groups Differed Significantly 37

Table 7 - Ten Most Positive Likert Items on Student Survey of Elementary Gifted Program . . 44

Table 8 - Five Most Negative Likert Items on Student Survey of Elementary Gifted Program 45

Table 9 - Likert Items on Student Survey of Elementary Gifted Program on Which the Groups Differed Significantly 46

Table 10 - Ten Most Positive Likert Items on Parent Survey of Junior High Gifted Program . . 53

Table 11 - Five Most Negative Likert Items on Parent Survey of Junior High Gifted Program 54

Table 12 - Likert Items on Parent Survey of Junior High Gifted Program on Which the Groups Differed Significantly 55

Table 13 - Ten Most Positive Likert Items on Teacher/Administrator Survey of Junior High Gifted Program 64

Table 14 - Five Most Negative Likert Items on Teacher/Administrator Survey of Junior High Gifted Program 65

Table 15 - Likert Items on Teacher/Administrator Survey of Junior High Gifted Progran on Which Groups Differed Significantly . . 66

Table 16 - Ten Most Positive Likert Items on Student Survey of Junior High Gifted Program . . 73

Table 17 - Five Most Negative Likert Items on Student Survey of Junior High Gifted Program 74

Table 18 - Likert Items on Student Survey of Junior High Gifted Program on Which Groups Differed Significantly 75

Page

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Goals and Objectives of Gifted Program; Current ELP Distribution by Grade and School; Identification, Screening, and Placement Procedures 114

APPENDIX B - Surveys of Gifted Program 130

APPENDIX C - Mean Responses to Likert Items 155

APPENDIX D - Summary of Open Comments 175

8

INTRODUCTION

The Research and Evaluation Department is currently conducting an evaluation of the Mesa Public Schools Gifted/Extended Learning Program. This report presents the results of attitudinal data about the current program and the direction it should take in the future collected from parents, teachers and administrators and students.

The gifted program offers a one day per week program at thirteen sites for qualifying elementary students in grades 3-6 and specific classes for the students at all junior and senior high schools.

Parents of gifted children, teachers, school administrators, members of the Superintendency and R & E personnel were involved with the development of the survey instruments. The target population which was sampled included students that were in either elementary or junior high gifted programs in 1980-81 and 1981-82. In turn, parents of these same students were included in the samples. The current classroom teachers, administrators, and teachers of the gifted were also included in the sample.

The results of the surveys were compiled and analyzed by Research and Evaluation. The surveys for parents, teachers and administrators, and students were analyzed separately for each program, elementary and junior high school. Frequencies were computed and data were analyzed to determine if the distribution of responses for each item differed between or among subgroups. Results were presented by overall responses except in cases where the subgroups differed significantly.

RESULTS

ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM/ELP

Parent Survey

1. Seventy-nine percent, fifty-six percent, and thirty-one percent of parents of elementary and junior high students gave excellent/above average ratings to the elementary, junior high, and high school programs, respectively. Although there is a discrepancy in the ratings, it should be remembered that as students move on to higher grades their attitudes and those of their parents decrease, at least in a relative sense. Also, fewer parents rated the higher level programs which may indicate less knowledge.

2. Over 60% of the parents believe that the Mesa Extended Learning Program should begin earlier than it does now. Twenty-four percent selected the kindergarten level, twenty percent first grade, and seventeen percent second grade as the level the program should begin.

3. Parents selected the programs similar to the types of existing programs for elementary, junior high, and high school. Enrichment and enrichment with some acceleration was selected for the elementary program; enrichment with some acceleration and enrichment for the junior high program; and acceleration with some enrichment and enrichment with some acceleration for the high school program.

4. Parents selected a resource program for the organization of the elementary gifted program. One full day per week pullout received the highest ranking and one to two hours per day pullout received the second ranking. The highest preference matches the current organization for ELP.

5. Parents favored a wide variety of opportunities as appropriate for gifted children: early admission to college (51%), field trips (84%), small group studies (81%), independent studies (81%), acceleration by subject (80%), out of grade level classes (73%), high school credit for college classes (71%), high school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes (61%), and advanced placement (56%). Only four opportunities did not receive at least 50%: early admission to kindergarten (23%), to junior high school (21%), to high school (28%), and grade skipping (20%).

6. On the items which solicited parent attitudes, parents were generally very positive. Parents responded positively toward the need for the gifted services (97%); parents' (88%), and child's (89%) general satisfaction with program; and satisfaction with teacher of gifted qualifications (72%) and availability (89%). Parents stated that their child(ren) were able to "keep up" with assignments in regular classes (93%) and in gifted classes (93%). In addition parents noted that their child(ren) were intellectually challenged (87%), proficient in problem solving (84%), and provided with the opportunities for new interests (88%).

The Likert items were further divided into six categories: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communications, Facilities, and Program Benefits. On Program Considerations parents were positive about the need for a gifted program, the need for grade level mastery prior to participation in the gifted program, and the need for students to be responsible for only unmastered concepts missed while in a gifted class. Parents also responded that a child who is gifted in one or two areas should receive services in those areas and that they were satisfied with a part-time gifted program. For the other categories overall means were calculated (the closer to 1.0 the more positive the mean) which represent parent attitudes toward the categories: Program Placement, 2.50; Classroom Expectations, 2.23; Communication, 2.14; Facilities, 2.91; and Program Benefits, 2.13.

Parents were negative about their child(ren) having to complete all regular class work (26%), and having become aware of needs of others (42%). Parents also had concern about adequacy of instructional facilities (36%), transportation (42%), and explanation of child's placement results (53%).

Though there were ten items for which parents of elementary and junior high students differed in statistical significance, this difference was of degree. Parents of junior high students, like the students themselves, respond less positively to most attitudinal queries. Only one item of the ten had real practical significance. A higher percent of junior high parents (69%) than of elementary parents (38%) agreed that elementary students are academically prepared to enter the junior high program.

7. Of those parents who responded, a low percentage (17% at the most, but possibly less since some parents marked more than one response) indicated that their child had dropped out of the program. Reasons for dropping out included pressures from regular class and difficulties with gifted class.

8. With regard to information about the gifted program over half of the parents first learned about the program from a teacher (56%) and at parent/teacher conferences (53%). To obtain additional information, parents generally (76%) contacted teachers of the gifted. Thirty-seven percent of the parents had not visited the gifted class. Overall, the parents rated their involvement as not having very much (78%), but of those that had visited the class, 84% responded that it had increased their understanding.

Teacher and Administrator Survey

1. The survey results of the classroom teachers, administrators and ELP teachers had a consistent trend. Usually items were rated highest or lowest by ELP teachers; ratings of classroom teachers and administrators tended to be similar.

2. Sixty-seven percent of those respondents who had knowledge of the program rated the elementary program excellent/above average. On the rating of the junior high and senior high programs the responses of the three groups were significantly different. Of those who had knowledge of the program the percent of excellent/above average ratings were teachers, 48%; principals, 13%; and ELP teachers, 33%. The principal percent response was quite low, but the response was based upon only six principals. The ratings of

the senior high program though significant were somewhat more alike, teachers, 50%; principals, 50%; and ELP teachers 45%. The overall ratings for the junior high and high school programs were 42% and 44%, respectively.

Teachers and administrators did not rate the elementary and junior high program as highly as did parents, but rated the senior high program higher; elementary program - parents, 79%, teachers and administrators, 67%; junior high program - parents, 56%, teachers and administrators, 42%; and senior high program - parents, 31%, teachers and administrators, 44%.

3. Thirty-nine percent of the teachers and administrators believe that the gifted program should begin in grades K-2. This compares with the parent response of 60% for grades K-2 as the level the program should begin.

4. Teachers and administrators rated emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration, and enrichment as the program preferences for elementary which matches the existing program quite closely. For junior high and senior high emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration was also the first preference, but emphasis on acceleration with some enrichment was the second choice. These results differ slightly from the parents:

	Elementary Program		Junior High Program		High School Program	
	Parents	Teach./Adm.	Parents	Teach./Adm.	Parents	Teach./Adm.
Acceleration	4	4	4	4	3	3
Enrichment	1	2	2	3	4	4
Acceleration with Some Enrichment	3	3	3	2	1	2
Enrichment with Some Acceleration	2	1	1	1	2	1

For both parents and teachers/administrators some type of enrichment was favored for the elementary program, some form of enrichment or acceleration with enrichment for the junior high level, and combination of acceleration and enrichment for high school.

5. Teachers and administrators selected the one full day per week pullout program as the organization of the elementary gifted program. A one to two hour per day pullout program was the second choice. These rankings were the same as the parent rankings.

6. Classroom teachers, ELP teachers and administrators favored a variety of opportunities for gifted children, but differed among themselves. In general, ELP teachers had higher percentages (over 50%) of agreement for all items than did classroom teachers, administrators, or parents. ELP teachers were the only group to favor (69%) early admission to kindergarten and junior high (54%). Principals (62%) and ELP teachers (69%) favored early admission to high school. All groups, including parents, had greater than 50% for all items except some for early admission and items on grade skipping.

7. On the items which solicited teacher and administrator attitudes, the responses were generally positive. The groups responded positively toward the need for gifted services (92%) and the principals' support for the program (83%). The teachers and administrators agreed that the gifted program provides new interests (83%), the opportunity for indepth study of subjects (78%), communication activities (67%), and proficiency in problem solving and critical thinking (74%). The groups responded that gifted children can "keep up" in the regular class (82%), are intellectually challenged (70%), and should be responsible only for nonmastered concepts missed in the regular classroom.

The Likert items were divided into six categories: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communications, Facilities, and Program Benefits. The teachers/administrators responses to Program Considerations were similar to the parent responses. The overall means for the other categories were: Program Placement, 2.61; Classroom Expectations, 2.43; Communication, 2.38; Facilities, 2.82; and Program Benefits, 2.38. Except for Facilities, the teachers/administrators responses were less positive than the parent responses.

The combined groups did not agree that the type of program for elementary, junior high, and high school should be the same (44%), that gifted children perform better in the regular class because of the gifted class (32%) and that gifted children should complete any work missed in the regular class. Teachers and administrators disagree that facilities are adequate (34%), but also disagree that class size is too high (15%). On the class size item ELP teachers differed from classroom teachers and administrators and seventy-one percent responded that there are too many students in the classes. Generally teachers and administrators responded similarly and ELP teachers were either more positive (toward program) or more negative (toward testing, transportation, etc.). Parent responses were similar to the teacher and administrator groups in that they were generally positive toward the program. The items about which all groups showed concern tended to be procedural, such as completing of all regular class work, facilities, transportation, class size, and testing.

8. According to teacher and administrators, students have withdrawn from the gifted program because of leaving the area or academic difficulties in the regular or gifted class.

Student Survey

1. Eighty-four percent of the students rated the elementary program excellent/above average. This rating was higher than the parents (79%) or teacher/administrators (67%).

2. The students' perceptions of the elementary gifted program were quite high with the top ten items having nearly 80% agreement. These included items on the benefits of ELP activities and the ELP teachers. Students were less positive toward everyday practicality of activities (53%) and being treated more favorably by other students (21%) or teachers (24%). Some students (46%) felt that the regular class teacher expected them to complete work already understood, and a low percent (22%) feel that they should be responsible for all regular class work. On the five items on which elementary and junior high students differed, the elementary students were more positive. The overall means for categories of the Likert items were: Classroom Expectations, 2.00; Program Benefits, 2.00.

Comments

A high percentage of parents (83%), students (94%), teachers and administrators (46%) took the time to make comments about the elementary Extended Learning Program. Most parent and student comments were positive statements about the program. Both parents and teachers and administrators listed the need for better communication between groups. Classroom teachers and ELP teachers commented about concerns for the testing of students.

JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Parent Survey

1. Sixty-two percent, fifty-nine percent, and fifty-eight percent of parents of junior high and senior high students gave excellent/above average ratings to the elementary, junior high, and senior high programs,respectively. The ratings of the elementary program are slightly higher, than the junior high and senior high programs but not significantly so.

2. Over 58% of the parents believe that the Mesa Extended Learning Program should begin earlier than it does now. Thirty percent would have the program begin at kindergarten, sixteen percent at first grade, and twelve percent at second grade.

3. Parents selected programs similar to existing ones for all levels. Enrichment with some acceleration, and enrichment alone were selected for the elementary program; enrichment with some acceleration and acceleration with some enrichment were selected for the junior high program, and acceleration with some enrichment and enrichment with some acceleration were selected for the senior high program.

4. Parents ranked a one to two hours per day pullout program as the first choice for the junior high gifted program; a self-contained, five-day program was the second choice. The first choice matches the current organization at the junior high school.

5. Parents favored a wide variety of opportunities as appropriate for gifted children: acceleration by subject in any subject (80%), field trips (78%), high school credit for college classes (77%), independent studies (77%), small group studies (75%), out of grade level classes (72%), advanced placement (68%), and high school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes (67%), and early admission to college (53%). Only four items did not receive at least 50%: grade skipping (26%), and early admission to kindergarten (31%), junior high school (31%) and high school (40%).

6. Parents were generally quite positive on the attitudinal items. Parents responded positively toward the need for gifted services (95%), and the parents' (85%) and child's (87%) general satisfaction with the program. Parents stated that their child(ren) were able to "keep up" with assignments in regular (91%) and in gifted (91%) classes. In addition, parents noted that their child(ren) were intellectually challenged (80%), proficient in problem solving (85%), and aware of his/her capabilities (80%). Parents supported mastery in the "basic" subjects as a prerequisite for participation in gifted classes (76%), but responded that students gifted in only one or two areas should be given services in these areas (82%).

The Likert items were further divided into six categories: Program Consideration, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities, and Program Benefits. Of the Program Considerations items parents were positive about the need for a gifted program. They were slightly less positive in the need for grade level mastery prior to participation in the program, and the need for students gifted in one or two areas to receive services in those areas. For the other categories overall means were calculated (the closer to 1.0 the more positive the mean) which represent parent attitudes toward the categories: Program Placement, 2.63; Classroom Expectations, 2.48; Communication, 2.46; Facilities, 2.92; Program Benefits, 2.26.

Parents did not believe that the goals and objectives of the Mesa program were clearly defined (38%) or that they had received an adequate explanation of placement test results (48%). Parents also had concern for adequacy in instructional facilities (34%) and transportation (27%). Parents did not believe that students should complete any work missed in the regular class (42%).

On four items parents of junior high students and parents of senior high students had significantly different responses. The differences were of degree; parents of junior high students responded more favorably than did parents of senior high students.

7. Few parents responded that their children had dropped out of the program. Of those who did the main reasons for dropping out were general problems with the gifted program or not receiving benefit from the junior high gifted program.

8. Junior high parents first learned about the program from a teacher (41%) and from a magazine and newsletter (40%). Less than half of the parents had visited a gifted class, but of those that had, 69% indicated that it had increased their understanding of the program.

Teacher and Administrator Survey

1. Forty-nine percent of those respondents who had knowledge of the elementary program rated the program excellent/above average. The responses of teacher and administrators were different, in large part because junior high ELP teachers rated the program much lower (25%) than other groups. The excellent/above average overall rating for the junior high gifted program was 38%; the subgroups did not differ. The overall rating of the senior high program was 44%; the significant difference is seen in the responses of junior high principals (63%) and junior high teachers (35%). The teacher/administrator respondents rated these programs lower than did the parents, 49%, 38%, and 44% versus 62%, 59% and 58%.

2. Forty-two percent of the teacher/administrator respondents believed the gifted program should begin in grades K-2 as compared to 58% of the parent respondents.

3. The respondents selected enrichment and enrichment with some acceleration as the preferences of both the elementary and the junior high programs. Acceleration and acceleration with some enrichment were the program preferences for the senior high schools. The results differ slightly with the parents.

	Elementary Program		Junior High Program		High School Program	
	Parents	Teach./Adm.	Parents	Teach./Adm.	Parents	Teach./Adm.
Acceleration	4	4	4	4	3	1
Enrichment	2	1	3	2	4	4
Acceleration with Some Enrichment	3	3	2	3	1	2
Enrichment with Some Acceleration	1	2	1	1	2	3

The greatest disagreement between groups occurred at the high school level with teachers/administrators selecting acceleration as the first choice and parents having acceleration as the third choice.

4. Teachers and administrators selected the one to two hours per day pullout program as the organization preferred for the junior high program. This, in fact, is the present organization within the junior high schools. Parents also selected this organizational arrangement as their first preference.

5. Teachers and administrators selected a variety of opportunities for gifted students: early admission to college, advanced placement, out of grade level classes, acceleration by subject in any given area, independent studies, small group studies, and field trips received 60% or greater agreement by all groups. On two items, high school credit for college classes and high

school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes, junior high teachers and ELP teachers supported the item with over 60%, but junior high and senior high principals agree with only 40%. Early admission to kindergarten and grade skipping received less than 50% from all subgroups, while early admission to junior high was greater than fifty percent for ELP teachers only and early admission to high school received greater than fifty percent by classroom teachers and ELP teachers, but not principals. Parent responses most closely agreed with classroom teachers.

6. The items which solicited teacher and administrator perceptions were generally positive although classroom teachers responded consistently lower than ELP teachers and administrators. The overall responses also were lower than parent responses. The most positive overall responses were: children need gifted services over and above regular class instruction (93%), gifted children are able to "keep up" in the regular class (74%), a student gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas (80%), and students should demonstrate mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to participation in gifted (76%). Several other items received positive responses from principals and ELP teachers: principals demonstrate support for the gifted program, children are able to "keep up" in the gifted class, teachers of gifted classes are available for parent conferences and the program helps gifted children communicate their ideas, become more proficient in problem solving, and helps children to develop new interests.

The Likert items were further divided into six categories: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities, Program Benefits. The teacher/administrators' responses to Program Considerations were similar to the parent responses. The overall means for the other categories were: Program Placement, 2.76; Classroom Expectations, 2.83; Communication, 2.64; Facilities, 3.06; and Program Benefits, 2.63. Teacher/administrator responses were less positive than the parent responses for all categories.

The subgroups were less positive toward the clarity of the goals and objectives of the Mesa Gifted Program (21%), and the adequacy of gifted facilities (25%) and transportation (17%). The respondents did not agree that the program helps gifted students become aware of the needs of others (19%). Also, these groups did not believe that the type of program had to be the same for elementary, junior high and high school (42%). The parents had also responded negatively toward adequacy of facilities and transportation and a need for clarification of the goals and objectives.

Most items had significantly different responses between the subgroups. In general, the classroom teachers had the lower responses which account for the variability.

7. According to teacher and administrators students have withdrawn from the gifted program because of academic difficulties or moving from the area; parents had responded that most withdrawal was related to difficulties in the gifted class.

Student Survey

1. Sixty-four percent of the students rated the junior high program excellent/above average. This rating was higher than the parent rating (59%) or the teacher/administrator rating (38%).

2. The students' perceptions of the junior high program were quite high. The top ten items had seventy percent or higher agreement. Most of these items referred to benefits the students received from the program. Students did not feel they were being treated differently by other students (12%) or teachers (31%). Students have not been reading more because of the gifted class (41%) or have not become more aware of the needs of others (39%). Finally, students did not respond that the type of gifted program should be different by elementary, junior high and high school students (26%). For the items on which junior high and senior high students differed, the difference was of degree with both groups responding negatively. The overall means for the two categories were: Classroom Expectations, 2.41; Program Benefits, 2.29.

Comments

A high percentage of parents (77%), students (83%), and teachers and administrators (66%) took the time to comment about the junior high Extended Learning Program. All groups made generally positive comments toward the program. Parents and teachers and administrators noted that communication between parents and teachers, and ELP teachers and classroom teachers could be improved, and that entrance requirements, and testing and placement procedures should be reviewed. Parents stressed the need for better teachers, while teachers commented that more in-service for teachers is needed. Students made generally positive remarks.

to teach the gifted children. They felt that communication between teachers and parents is very good and that cooperation between the classroom teacher and the teacher of the gifted is more than adequate. These groups, however, do not view the program through rose-colored glasses. They don't feel that students perform better in the regular class as a result of the participation in the gifted class. Nor do they feel strongly that it has helped them become aware of the needs of others. They also feel that there are some problems with respect to instructional facilities and transportation. In a relative sense, they question the adequacy of the explanation of their children's placement test results and the testing services for placement in the gifted program.

In addition, parents and teachers/administrators felt that the elementary program should begin sooner than it does now. These groups also felt that some other adjustments should be made so that students could get credit for taking advanced courses while remaining in their current grade. That is, elementary students should receive credit for high school courses, and senior high students should receive credit for college courses. They also felt acceleration should be available by subject in any subject area as should independent studies. They did not, however, favor grade skipping.

The comments agreed in large part with the responses to the closed response items made by the three groups. The highest proportion of comments were positive comments about the program in general. However, there were some comments directed toward the

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM/ELP

As perceived by parents, teachers/administrators and students, there is a strong need for services and/or programs beyond the regular classroom for gifted children. The program as offered by the Mesa Public Schools is above average to excellent. The method of implementing the program, i.e., a one full day per week pullout program emphasizing enrichment with some acceleration is the preferred method of implementation. The program as implemented delivers on its goals and objectives and/or expectations. That is, there are positive changes in the students participating in the program. The students become aware of their capabilities, they develop and/or maintain a positive perception of themselves, they improve their communication skills, and their problem solving and critical thinking skills are enhanced. The program accomplishes this through challenging and motivating the students in the gifted classroom, providing relevant enrichment activities, allowing the students to pursue in greater depth subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested, and offering a sufficient variety of subjects in the gifted classroom.

The three groups surveyed also viewed a number of the process variables in a very positive light. They felt that the goals and objectives of the ELP are clearly defined, that the grading procedures are adequate, and that the teachers are well-qualified improvement of communication between parents and teachers, the broadening of the scope of subjects offered and the need for a better transition between elementary and junior high. Viewing these comments with the total responses made by the groups indicates that they are not broadly held concerns, but they are concerns of a number of the parents, teachers/administrators, and/or students.

As the vast majority of responses made by all groups to all the surveys dealing with the elementary gifted program were positive and in support of the current program, it is strongly recommended that no significant changes in the program be made at this time. However, some minor changes can be addressed and some further investigations made. Facilities seems to be bothersome to a number of the respondents. The work required of the students when they return from the gifted classes is perceived also as a potential problem by parents and students. It is recommended that a policy be established concerning the specifics of the work the student is held responsible for or has to make up.

Also the feasibility should be determined, which would include investigations of cost, concerning the implementation of the gifted program at an earlier age and/or grade. The feasibility of credit for elementary students taking high school courses should also be determined.

JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

As perceived by parents, teachers/administrators, and students, there is a strong need for services and/or programs beyond the regular classroom for gifted students at the junior high level. The program, as offered by the Mesa Public Schools, is perceived to be above average to excellent. There is, however, a relatively high percentage of respondents, especially from the teacher/administrator group, that feel the program offered at the junior high is only average or below average to poor.

The method of implementing the program, i.e., a one to two hour per day pullout program emphasizing enrichment with some acceleration, is the preferred method of implementation. The program as implemented delivers its goals and objectives and/or expectations; that is, there are positive changes in the students participating in the program. The students become aware of their capabilities, they develop and/or maintain a positive perception of themselves, and they improve their communication skills. Their problem solving and critical thinking skills are enhanced. The program accomplishes these changes through challenging and motivating the students in the gifted classroom, providing relevant enrichment activities, allowing the students to pursue in greater depth subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested, and generally providing environment for children to develop new interests.

The teachers/administrators, although agreeing to the above statements were not quite as positive. They questioned the motivational factor of the program, the relevance of all activities, and whether or not the students' individual needs are being met in the classroom.

The three groups surveyed also viewed a number of the process variables in a positive light. They felt that the criteria the students have to meet to qualify for the program are reasonable, the grading procedures being used in the gifted classes are adequate, the teachers of the gifted students are qualified to teach in the program, and the teachers in the gifted classes are readily available for conferences.

These groups, however, were not entirely uncritical of the program. They did not feel that the gifted program has helped the students become aware of the needs of others. Nor did they feel that there are a sufficient variety of subjects in the gifted class. They also felt that there are problems with the general instructional facilities and transportation. These groups also questioned the adequacy of information received concerning the student's progress and whether or not adequate information on the criteria needed to qualify for the program has been shared; the same is true concerning the explanation of the student's placement test results. And they questioned whether or not the testing services for student placement in the gifted program are adequate. Although the junior high parents felt that their children were adequately prepared to enter the junior high gifted program, this item was questioned by the teacher/administrator respondents.

In addition, these groups felt that some adjustments should be made so that students could get credit for taking advanced courses while remaining in their current grade, that is, elementary students should receive credit for high school courses and senior high students should receive credit for college courses. They also felt acceleration should be available by subject in any subject area, as should independent studies. They did not, however, favor grade skipping.

The comments made by the respondents agreed in large part with the responses to the closed response items. There were, however, some areas which indicated some disagreement. It would appear that over all respondents a given area is viewed favorably, but there is still a high proportion of those responding that consider it a problem area, or at least a potential problem area. The highest proportion of comments were directed toward better communication between teachers and parents. The parents presented in their written comments a need for better teachers with the second highest proportion of their responses. Also high in the number of responses were general positive comments about the program. It also appears that there is some concern about the transition from the elementary to the junior high program. Compared to the total responses made by these groups, the comments are not broadly held concerns, but they are concerns of a number of parents, teachers/ administrators, and/or students.

As the vast majority of responses made by all groups to all the surveys dealing with the junior high gifted program were positive and in support of the current program, it is strongly recommended that no significant changes in the program be made at this time. Some minor changes, however, can be addressed and some further investigations made. Facilities seem to be bothersome for a number of the respondents. Also, the work required of the students when they return from the gifted classes is perceived as a potential problem area. It is recommended that a policy be established concerning specifics of the work the students are to be held responsible for or have to make up. It would also appear that a review of the teachers in the program might be warranted. The junior high program has changed over the years and it could be that the exact placement of the teachers of the gifted is not the best placement for these teachers at this time. It would also appear that a review of the goals and objectives of the junior high program should be made and, if needed, a redefinition made. These goals should be publicized so that the different publics know the specifics of the program. This should also occur with respect to the specific criteria needed to enter the program and the resulting placement test results that the students receive.

Feasibility should also be investigated concerning the implementation of acceleration of courses within each subject area and the use of independent studies as well. The feasibility of credit for junior high students taking high school courses should also be determined.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Research and Evaluation was requested by the Deputy Superintendent for Educational Services to conduct an evaluation on the Mesa Gifted Program/Extended Learning Program, ELP. (Throughout this report gifted and ELP will be used interchangeably.) The evaluation would consist of three main parts: 1) attitudinal data about the current program and the direction it should take in the future collected from parents, teachers, administrators and students; 2) test data regarding the achievement of ELP students; and 3) financial data about the cost of the ELP program. This report presents the results of the first part of the ELP evaluation. A final report to be completed in June, 1983, will encompass all three parts of the evaluation. In addition, Tech Memo's on some later requests will be completed this spring. Requests included analysis of survey results by school site and cross-tabulation of parent involvement with response to specific items.

The Department of Research and Evaluation has assisted the Director of this program in attempting to evaluate the program from its inception. The results of the first five years of the Gifted/Extended Learning Program have been documented in the following reports:

> Evaluation Plan 1974-75 Mesa's Gifted Program, February, 1975, TR-17
>
> Perception of Mesa's Elementary Resource Center Program (Parents, Students, and Teachers), September, 1977, TR-34

Gifted Program Evaluation, 1974-75, January, 1976, RR-18

Gifted and Talented Program Evaluation, 1975-76, February, 1976, RR-19

Tech Memos

An Interim Evaluation of Mesa's Gifted Program, May 27, 1975

Executive Summary of "An Interim Evaluation of Mesa's Gifted Program," June 4, 1975

Perceptions of Mesa's Resource Center Program 1976-77, October 13, 1977

DOSC Results, February 22, 1978

Gifted Program Student Selection Procedure, April 26, 1978

Evaluation Gifted Resource Center Program, 1977-78, July 17, 1978

DOSC Results, May 21, 1979

Evaluation of Gifted Resource Center Program 1978-79, August 24, 1979

Structure of the Intellect Program, August 31, 1979

Correlations Among Different Measures Used to Assess Students in the Gifted Program, September 13, 1979

Comparison of ELP at Two Elementary Schools, July 21, 1982

Because the elementary program was undergoing major organizational changes, no formal program evaluation was completed during the past three years. This is also true of the junior high school program. The junior high school program was instituted later than that at the elementary level and prior to this document had no formal evaluation. The evaluation design for this year is directed toward the elementary and junior high programs. The senior high program is not included as it is felt that it is not the same type of program as those for the elementary and junior high. At the senior high level the program is directed more toward acceleration in the advanced placement classes. The advanced placement program is monitored annually documenting the courses offered, the students taking those courses and their performance on the advanced placement tests.

Program Description

In 1974-75 a resource program for gifted students was offered in 1st through 6th grades at three elementary schools and one junior high school. Today, under the supervision of Eleanor TeSelle, all elementary (exception Franklin Elementary), junior high, and senior high schools are served. There are a total of approximately 692 elementary school students, 469 junior high students (partially duplicated count), and 380 senior high students (partially duplicated count) compared to the total of 81 students served in 1974-75.

The Extended Learning Program offers a resource program for all elementary schools, and provides specific classes at the junior high and senior high school levels. The offerings at the junior and senior highs include accelerated and advanced placement classes. Other services include a humanities program and a program for the mathematically precocious at the junior high level. The goals and objectives of the Mesa Extended Learning Program are included in Appendix A.

The elementary ELP serves students in grades 3-6 in thirteen locations throughout the district. There are 13.1 full-time equivalent (F.T.E.) teachers serving the elementary program. There are 692 students in the ELP, of these, 277 students are bused to a different school site for instruction.

The junior high program includes 469 students at eight junior high schools. In four schools (Carson, Fremont, Kino, and Rhodes) both English and social studies ELP are offered. Thus, the counts are duplicated; that is, students may be in both programs. At the remaining junior high schools, ELP is taught through the core curriculum. The high schools offer an advanced placement program. This year 23 advanced placement courses are being taught in English, calculus, American history, chemistry, physics, and biology to 380 students. Since students may be enrolled in more than one course, the 380 is a partially duplicated count. The district provides the junior high and high schools with twelve 2/5 contracts. Additional ELP or AP classes are supplied by the school through scheduling. (See Appendix A for numbers by grade and school.)

At present the elementary ELP is a resource program one day per week for students in grades 3-6; both junior high and high school programs meet daily for the period the student is enrolled in a class. Students may be recommended for this program by a parent, teacher, principal, the school psychologist, resource teacher, or the student himself/herself. Specific procedures for identification, screening and placement are presented in detail in Appendix A.

METHODS

Survey Development

Input concerning the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Programs was solicited from 15 different groups. These groups were:

Elementary Program

Parents of elementary students currently in the elementary program

Parents of elementary students no longer in the elementary program

Students in the elementary program

Students no longer in the elementary program

Teachers in all elementary schools with the exception of Franklin Elementary

Teachers of the elementary ELP

Principals in all elementary schools with the exception of Franklin Elementary

Junior High Program

Parents of students in the junior high program

Parents of students no longer in the junior high program

Students in the junior high program

Students no longer in the junior high program

Teachers at all junior high schools

Teachers of the junior high gifted program

Principals and assistant principals at all junior high schools

Principals and assistant principals at all senior high schools

Basically three survey instruments were designed to solicit input from each of these 15 groups: parent survey, student survey, and teacher and administrator survey. Slight variations were made in the three basic surveys to incorporate the specifc knowledge of the groups being sampled. The first survey to be designed was the survey for the parents. The other two surveys were designed so that a core of items was similar on all three survey instruments.

The parent survey was developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation with significant input and review by parent representatives, district gifted program review committee and administrators. Initially a meeting was held with Dr. Billie Thompson, the President of the Mesa Parents' Association for the Gifted and Talented (MPAGT); Mrs. Eleanor TeSelle, the Director of the Extended Learning Program (ELP); Dr. Phelps Wilkins, Principal of Roosevelt Elementary School and Co-chair of the District Committee on Gifted; Bob Parker, a parent and Co-chair of the District Committee on the Gifted; Ms. Fredericka Bowdene, Researcher for the MPAGT, and representatives of the Department of Research and Evaluation, James DeGracie and Judy Rule. During this meeting a general outline for the evaluation of the Mesa Gifted Programs was outlined. The discussion was directed not only toward the development of survey instruments and which groups would be surveyed, but also included some discussion of analysis of cost data and cognitive or test data.

Following that meeting, the Department of Research and Evaluation began the development of a survey instrument to be used to solicit input from the parents of gifted students. During the development of the instruments, meetings were held with Ms. Bowdene, Dr. Wilkins, and Mr. Parker to share information concerning the development of the survey as well as other information concerning gifted programs in general. Upon the completion of the initial draft of the survey for the parents of the gifted, the draft instrument was shared with Ms. Bowdene and the MPAGT Board. The draft was also critiqued by Dr. Barnard, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Mrs. TeSelle; and the Committee on Gifted Programs. Revisions to the original instrument were made and the instrument was again shared with parents for a final review.

The resulting parent survey had 63 items; 60 were closed response items and three solicited comments from the parents. The parents were asked to respond by checking given responses or by ranking the items which were directed toward four major areas. Demographic or general items solicited input from the parents concerning the age of the child, sex, and current grade, as well as input about where the parent received information concerning gifted children, which group they contacted concerning Mesa's Gifted Program, and degree of involvement with the program.

A second area tapped by the survey was quality of program. Here the parents were asked to rate the gifted program from excellent to poor on a 5-point scale. Each of the parent groups was asked to rate each of the areas: elementary, junior high and senior high, even though they may not have had children that participated in them.

The third area tapped by the parent survey solicited direction for the gifted program. In general, the questions were directed toward the program that their child currently attended or had attended. However, one of the items asked the parents to rank program types for each of the areas: elementary, junior high and senior high. A definition of types was given for the areas: acceleration, acceleration with some enrichment, enrichment, and enrichment with some acceleration. The remaining items soliciting direction concerned only the current program or the types of opportunities that should be available for gifted children.

The fourth major area tapped by the survey included 44 Likert items to which the parent responded on a 5-point scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. These items were directed toward: general attitude toward the current program, and general process items dealing with such things as transportation, student selection, facilities, etc. A copy of the parent survey as well as other surveys is included in Appendix B.

The teacher/administrator survey instrument was developed with the parent survey, but its finalization was not made until general approval of the parent survey had been received. The teacher/administrator survey did not undergo the heavy critique that the parent survey had since most items had already been finalized. It was critiqued by the Director of the ELP program, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, the Deputy Superintendent, teachers in the ELP program and representatives of the parent group. The teacher/administrator survey was almost identical to the parent survey. The only changes made were the elimination of those items directed toward the children of the parents and changes to facilitate the analysis of the resulting information. There was a total of 58 items on the teacher/administrator survey with 56 closed response items and 2 open items. Of the four areas tapped in the parent survey, demographic or general, quality of programs, program direction, and Likert items, all but the demographic or general items were included. The 38 Likert items on the teacher/administrator survey were directed toward general attitude and process.

The student survey also was reviewed by the Director of the ELP program, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, the Deputy Superintendent, representatives of the teachers in the ELP program, and representatives of parent groups. The student survey was directed toward three of the four areas, omitting program direction. However, only two demographic items were asked and the item on quality of program solicited the students' input only for the program for which the survey was designed. That is, the survey for the elementary ELP program asked the students only about the elementary ELP program, and the survey for the junior high gifted program asked the junior and senior high students that had participated in the program only about the junior high program. The junior high survey had 24 Likert items, and the elementary survey had 25 Likert items. Again, they were divided into general attitude and process items and mapped back to the parent survey as well as the teacher/ administrator survey. Two items on both of the surveys were open response items soliciting the students' concerns in the area of what they liked most about the gifted program and what they would change about the gifted program.

Sampling

The target population which was sampled included all students that were in either elementary or junior high gifted programs in 1980-81 and 1981-82. In turn, the parents of the same students were sampled. The decision to use students of past years versus students currently in the program insured that a general perspective would be obtained through the sampling. Surveying students from two years and one year ago insured that some of the students responding were already in junior high and possibly junior high programs. In turn, their parents had the perspective of how well these students were prepared for junior high. At the same time, it insured that students who had dropped out of their gifted program, as well as their parents, were also asked to respond to surveys. The current teachers, administrators, and teachers of the gifted from the total district were asked to respond to the survey (except for Franklin Elementary School, which does not have a gifted program).

Parents

As noted in the above introduction, the target population determining student and parent populations consisted of students that participated in the gifted program in the Mesa Schools during the school years 1980-81 and 1981-82. The students that were in the elementary program during those years are students currently in grades 4-8. The students that were in junior high programs in those years are currently enrolled in grades 8-11. Target populations for both students and parents were restricted to those students who were currently enrolled in the Mesa Public Schools, although students may not currently be enrolled in the gifted program.

A 100% sample of all parents was used. Data Processing furnished address labels for the parents of all students who were coded as being in the gifted programs for the two years under study. At five of the junior high schools program codes had not been affixed in the data base; therefore, class lists were generated for these gifted classes for those two years, and parent mailing labels were generated from these lists. In the generation of the lists and through matching each of the lists, attempts were made to insure that each family received only one survey for a given program, elementary or junior high. In the generation of the address labels for both the elementary and junior high programs, Data Processing randomly selected the name of only one child from each family. That is, if a given family had two or more children that were in the gifted program, only one name was randomly selected and the parents were asked to respond to the survey with respect to that given child's experiences.

The label generated by Data Processing was affixed to an envelope along with a transmittal letter for the parents which was sent to the listed student through the classroom teacher. The classroom teacher was instructed to have the student take the survey home and return the completed survey as soon as possible to the school secretary.

Students

A 100% sample of students that participated in the program in the target years was used. The sampling procedure used for parents was duplicated for students. In this case, Data Processing produced labels by student name. Again, a match was made to attempt to insure that a given student would respond to only one survey. However, all the children in the gifted program from a given family were to complete the survey. The surveys were distributed to the students through the classroom teacher. They were completed during class time and returned by the teacher to the school secretary.

Classroom Teachers

Fifty percent of all teachers in grades 3-6 were sampled with the elementary survey, and 50% of the teachers in grades 7-9 were sampled with the junior high survey. At the elementary level, Franklin School was not included because it does not have a gifted program. Teacher surveys were sent to principals, who were asked to distribute them randomly to one-half of the classroom teachers in their building.

Administrators and Teachers of the Gifted

All administrators and teachers of the gifted were asked to respond to a gifted survey for their level, either elementary or junior high. The teacher/administrator surveys, however, include two questions which solicited responses concerning all three programs: elementary, junior high, and high school.

Data Analysis

After the surveys had been administered and returned, the data was compiled and analyzed by Research and Evaluation. For the teacher/administrator and student surveys, bubble sheets were scanned, and for the parent surveys, results were keypunched. Open response items were summarized separately.

Because the surveys differed for each group, results were analyzed separately for parents, teacher/administrators, and students. Furthermore, it was decided not to compare results for the elementary and junior high programs since they differ considerably. Therefore, results were obtained for six groups: parents, teachers/administrators, and students, for the elementary and junior high program. Because of the complex sampling procedures, each of these groups was further subdivided for comparison purposes in the analyses. The resulting groups were:

Elementary Gifted Program

Parents: Parents of gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are still in elementary school

Parents of gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are now in junior high school

Teachers/Administrators: Elementary teachers
Elementary principals
Elementary ELP teachers

Students: Gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are still in elementary school

Gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are now in junior high school

Junior High Gifted Program

Parents: Parents of gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are still in junior high school

Parents of gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are now in high school

Teachers/Administrators: Junior high teachers
Junior high principals
High school principals
Junior high ELP teachers

Students: Gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are still in junior high school

Gifted students (from 1980-81 and/or 1981-82) who are now in high school

To determine if the distribution of responses for each item differed between or among the subgroups Chi-square analyses were used. A probability level of p <.01 was chosen for determining significant differences. Results will be presented for each overall group except in cases where the subgroups differed significantly.

In order to summarize the results of the large number of Likert items, predetermined criteria were established. The ten most positive items and the five most negative items for each group were presented. More positive items than negative items were included since the overall results of these surveys were very positive. The most positive and negative items were determined based on item means. The reader is cautioned when examining these items that they were positive or negative only in relation to other items. That is, an item may have been among the ten most positive even though it was not very high, just as an item might have been among the five most negative even though it was not very low. A further caution is that not all the Likert items were worded to indicate a positive or negative attitude or aspect of the program. Therefore, an item may have been listed as positive or negative, based on its item mean being more extreme than other items, even though it did not indicate a positive or negative attitude. In addition to the positive and negative items, all items on which subgroups differed significantly were presented. In order to collapse and simplify the data, results of the Likert items were presented in terms of the percentages of respondents who strongly agreed or agreed to the item.

Because a large portion of the information solicited from the respondents was in the form of Likert items, it was felt that these items should be further categorized for ease in discussion. In addition to highlighting those items which received the highest positive response, the highest negative response and those items that differed significantly among the responses by the different samples, it was felt that the areas tapped by the items could be combined to give the reader even more information. The Likert items appeared to fall into six major areas: items directed toward Program Considerations, items on Program Placement, items on Classroom Expectations, items on Communication, items concerning Facilities and items measuring Program Benefits. The means for all Likert items for all groups are presented in Appendix C by general area. Means were then found for each area with exception of Program Considerations. A number of the items under Program Considerations were really directed toward different groups' perceptions of the given items and were not felt to be positive or negative as were items placed under the other categories. In considering the means presented in Appendix C, operational definitions are useful. For the purpose of this report the operational definitions of the means for the five-point Likert items are:

Positive Response (3.0 or less)	1.50 or less	Strongly Agree
	1.51 - 2.50	Agree
	2.51 - 3.50	Undecided/Don't Know
Negative Response (3.1 or more)	3.51 - 4.50	Disagree
	4.51 or greater	Strongly Disagree

Using the operational definition, the area between 2.5 and 3.5 would be a range indicating an undecided or don't know opinion. The five-point scale has 3 as the midpoint; any value less than 3 indicates a positive response and any value greater than 3 a negative response. The closer the mean gets to 1 the more positive the average response made by the group; the closer to 5 the more negative.

Using the first operational definition, the means can be placed into the five original response categories, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This scale is particularly appropriate for those items which were not worded to indicate a positive or negative attitude or aspect of the program. The second operational definition provides another way of interpreting the data by setting an arbitrary midpoint of 3. Any value less than 3 indicates a positive response and any value greater than 3 indicates a negative response. The closer the mean gets to 1 the more positive average response made by the group; the closer to 5 the more negative. This scale allows undecided/don't know responses to be interpreted as positive or negative, rather than just neutral. For example, a mean of 2.8 falls in the undecided category, but it is on the positive side of the midpoint.

RESULTS

Elementary Gifted Program

Parent Survey

Surveys concerning the elementary gifted program (Extended Learning Program, ELP) were sent to 747 parents. Of these, 436 parents responded for a return rate of 58%. Data on elementary gifted students, whose parents completed the surveys, indicated that 48% were male and 52% female.

Parents were asked to give an overall rating of Mesa's Gifted Program at the elementary, junior high, and senior high levels. Their responses were:

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High
Excellent/ Above Average	79%	56%	31%
Average	18%	33%	51%
Below Average/ Poor	3%	11%	18%

Nearly 80% of the respondents believe the elementary program is above average or excellent. This number decreases to 56% who believe the junior high program is above average or excellent, and to only 31% at the senior high level.

One group of questions on the survey dealt with parents' opinions of how Mesa's Gifted Program should be structured. When asked at what grade level the gifted program should begin, the following responses were given:

Kindergarten	24%	Fourth	9%
First	20%	Fifth	2%
Second	17%	Sixth	.2%
Third	28%	Tenth	.2%

Therefore, over 60% of the elementary parents believe the program should begin earlier than it now does.

Another item asked parents to rank their preference as to what type of program Mesa should have if it were to be changed, for each level (elementary, junior high, and senior high). These preferences were to be based on the following operational definitions:

> Acceleration increases instructional pace or school grade progress for high ability students. This includes early admission, grade skipping, advanced placement, and speeded-up presentation of content material.
>
> Enrichment provides supplementary activities and instruction for gifted students including general exploratory activities, group training activities, and individual and small group investigations of real problems. The expansion and modification of the curriculum is intended to make the material presented more challenging.

Based on these definitions, parents gave the following rankings (1 is highest ranking, 2 next, and so on) at each level for four types of programs.

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior* High
Acceleration	4	4	3
Enrichment	1	2	4
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	3	3	1
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	2	1	2

Parents shifted their preferences from enrichment at the elementary level to emphasis on acceleration with enrichment at the high school level. However, at the high school level, parents of students who are now in junior high differed significantly from parents with gifted children who are still in elementary. Parents of junior high students ranked the programs in the following order: emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration, emphasis on acceleration with some enrichment, enrichment, acceleration.

With regard to location and time spent in gifted classes, parents were asked to rank five possible organizations. With (1) being the highest preference, results were as follows:

Rank	
1	Resource program - 1 full day per week pullout program.
2	Resource program - 1 to 2 hours per day pullout program.
3	Self-contained - 5 full days per week with teacher of the gifted.
4	After school program - 1-3 hours per week after school hours.
5	Five full days per week in a special school.

---

*Significant difference in response of parents of junior high students and parents of elementary students for the Elementary Gifted Program.

Results of this item indicate that parents favor this aspect of the elementary gifted program as it exists now - one full day per week pullout program.

Parents were given a list of possible opportunities for gifted children and were asked to check any they felt were appropriate. Following are the percentages of parents who checked each opportunity as being appropriate:

Early admission to:	Kindergarten	23%
	Junior High	21%
	High School	28%
	College	51%
Field trips		84%
Small group studies		81%
Independent studies		81%
Acceleration by subject in any subject area		80%
Out of grade level classes		73%
High school credit for college classes		71%
High school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes		61%
Advanced placement		56%
Grade skipping		20%

The results of this item are reflective of those from the previous one. Parents believe that enrichment activities, as well as acceleration in some classes, are appropriate, but not early admission or grade skipping, particularly at the elementary and junior high levels.

In addition to the above items, parents were asked to respond to forty-three Likert-type items concerning various aspects of the gifted program. They could select the following responses to the items: strongly agree, agree, undecided/don't know, disagree, and strongly disagree. Overall the results were positive; the mean responses to these items can be found in Appendix C. The ten most positive items (based on item means) are listed in Table 1. There is no overall pattern to these items; several deal with general perceptions, two with teachers, and several with more specific aspects of the program. The five most negative Likert items (based on item means) are listed in Table 2. It should be noted again that these items may only be negative in a relative sense. That is, 1/4 to over 1/2 of those responding agreed or strongly agreed to the statement. Also, some of the statements are worded such that lack of agreement with the statement does not indicate a negative aspect of the program. All five of the negative items deal with specific aspects of the program.

Listed in Table 3 are ten items, on which the responses of elementary parents differed significantly from the responses of junior high parents. On eight of these items, junior high parents were more negative than elementary parents. However, junior high parents were more likely to agree that gifted elementary students are prepared to enter the junior high gifted program (item 56).

TABLE 1

TEN MOST POSITIVE LIKERT ITEMS
ON PARENT SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Elementary Parents	Jr. High Parents	Overall
14. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	97	97	97
29. The teachers of classes for gifted children are qualified to teach gifted children.	79	62	72
30. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available if I request a conference.	93	83	89
37. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in his/her regular class.	93	94	93
38. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	91	94	92
39. My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	93	83	89
40. I have been pleased with my child's experiences in the gifted program.	91	83	88
47. The gifted classes have helped my child become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	84	83	84
49. The gifted program has provided the opportunities for my child to develop new interests.	92	83	88
50. My child is intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	87	86	87

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

R

TABLE 2

FIVE MOST NEGATIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON PARENT SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Elementary Parents	Jr. High Parents	Overall
19. I received an adequate explanation of my child's placement test results.	49	58	53
23. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	39	32	36
24. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	42	43	42
36. I feel that my child should complete _any_ work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	21	33	26
45. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of the needs of others.	41	42	42

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 3

LIKERT ITEMS ON PARENT SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM ON WHICH ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH PARENTS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Elementary Parents	Jr. High Parents	Overall
29. The teachers of classes for gifted children are qualified to teach gifted children.	79	62	72
30. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available if I request a conference.	93	83	89
31. There are too many students in my child's gifted class for adequate instruction.	10	24	16
32. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep me adequately informed of my child's progress.	75	61	69
35. I feel that my child should be responsible only for nonmastered concepts missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	70	56	65
36. I feel that my child should complete any work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	21	33	26
39. My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	93	83	89
49. The gifted program has provided the opportunities for my child to develop new interests.	92	83	88
50. My child is intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	87	86	87
56. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	38	69	50

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

As noted in the methods section, the Likert items were further subdivided into six areas: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities, and Program Benefits. Overall means were found for five of the areas; it was felt that Program Considerations could not be combined, as the items, although falling into a general category, were perceptions of the respondents to specific program considerations which could not be perceived as positive or negative, and could not be meaningfully combined into an overall measure.

Under Program Considerations the parents strongly agreed that a need exists for services or programs beyond the regular curriculum for gifted children. They also agreed that a student should demonstrate mastery on the basic subjects prior to being allowed in the gifted program. They responded a child gifted in one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas. The parents were undecided concerning whether their child has been allowed to progress in the regular classroom through concepts as they were mastered. They agreed that their child should be responsible only for nonmastered concepts missed while he or she received gifted instruction; thus, they disagreed that students should complete any work that was missed. Yet, according to parents, the regular classroom teacher expects the child to complete work that they felt was missed while he or she received gifted instruction. The parents' response to the type of program for elementary, junior and senior high being the same was slightly above the 2.5 response which placed it in the undecided area. In response to the amount of time per week children spend in the program, parents responded with satisfaction to the part-time program; but, when reworded to ask if the time in gifted classes was sufficient, parents were undecided.

On the remaining five areas the overall means fell in the agree category. The overall mean for Program Placement was 2.5, with three of the five items falling in the undecided category. The positive response to the items concerning the reasonableness of the placement criteria and the child's placement within 60 days yielded a mean of 2.2 overall. The parents were less positive to the items concerning information on the criteria needed to qualify for the gifted program, the adequacy of the explanation of the child's placement test and the testing services for the gifted program. All three of these items, however, had a mean smaller than 3.0, indicating that the overall response of the parents was, in fact, on the positive side.

For the area, Classroom Expectations, the overall mean was 2.23 indicating a positive response by the parents in the expectations of the classroom. The mean response to all items fell in the agree area with the exception of class size. This item, which was worded in the opposite direction, received a converted mean of 2.62, indicating that the parents' responses were in the undecided area. Concerning other items, the parents were positive concerning their child's ability to keep up with assignments both in the regular class and the gifted class. As noted previously, they feel that the students are prepared to enter junior high with the parents of junior high students feeling more positive toward this than the parents of the elementary students. Parents were also positive concerning the qualifications of the teachers of the gifted and positive concerning the grading procedures used in the gifted classrooms and the clarification of the goals and objectives of the Mesa Gifted Program.

The overall mean for the three items measuring Communication was a positive 2.14. The parents felt very positive when queried whether or not the teachers of the gifted classroom were available for conferences. They were also positive concerning the information they received on their children's progress in the gifted classes, and they viewed the cooperation between the classroom teachers and the teachers of the gifted in a positive manner.

The one general area which fell into a no opinion category with a mean of 2.91 was Facilities. The parents viewed the adequacy of the instructional facilities with a no opinion response, although it fell on the positive side of the midpoint. The parents were more positive concerning the adequacy of transportation, but still the mean was 2.79, falling in the undecided category.

The area of Program Benefits received a positive response by the parents with an overall mean of 2.13. The only two items which did not receive an agree response, with means slightly above 2.5, were whether or not the program helped children become aware of the needs of others and whether the child performed better in the regular classroom as a result of the participation in the gifted program. The means to the other items were in the agree range. For example, the children's enjoyment of the program had a mean of 1.60, and the parents' being pleased with the child's experiences a mean of 1.74. The parents viewed the benefits to their children as being very positive; these benefits include positive change in the student, being intellectually challenged, awareness of capabilities, and developing a positive perception of themselves. They were also positive toward areas that are inherent in the program. The parents felt that there are a sufficient variety of subjects being offered in the gifted program. They felt that the program motivates the child, helps their communications skills, helps their critical thinking skills, gives them the opportunity to delve more deeply into subjects that interest them, and that the enrichment activities are relevant.

Parents whose children had once participated in a gifted program but do so no longer were asked to check one or more reasons for withdrawal. A percentage of the total number of parents responding to the survey cannot be calculated since this is a duplicated count. However, considering that only 76 reasons were checked, it represents a small percentage of the total sample. A breakdown of the reasons checked is as follows (percentages are calculated based upon 76 responses):

Difficulties in the gifted program	11%
Graduated out of the program	11%
Did not benefit from gifted involvement	13%
Teacher pressure in regular classes	12%
Unable to "keep up" with assignments in regular classes	8%
Missing out on too many activities in regular classes	14%
Other (please specify):	32%

Most of the reasons specified under "other" were more specific instances of the broader reasons given. They included such things as: dissatisfaction with the teacher, too much work (interfering with other activities), schedule conflicts with electives (e.g. chorus), peer pressure, lack of transportation and loss of interest in the program.

Five questions on the survey dealt with how the parents got information about the gifted program and their degree of involvement in the program. Over half of the parents (56%) learned about the program from a teacher, 29% learned about it from the school, 4% from a parent, and 11% from other sources. When asked where they receive most of their information about gifted children, responses were as follows: parent/teacher conferences (53%), magazines and newsletters (37%), school personnel (9%), and workshops about gifted (1%). When asked how many times they had visited their child's gifted class, 37% of the parents responded 0 or 1 and 49% between 2-6 times. Of those that had visited the class, 84% responded that it had increased their understanding of the program. Parents contacted the following groups most frequently about Mesa's Gifted Program: teacher of gifted classes (76%), regular classroom teacher (14%), school administration (6%), school board (5%) and Mesa Parents Associate of Gifted and Talented (4%). When asked to rate the extent of their involvement in Mesa's Gifted Program, parents gave the following responses: a great deal (4%), moderately (18%), and not very much (78%).

Teacher and Administrator Survey

The sample for this survey included all elementary principals, all elementary ELP teachers, and 1/3 of the elementary teachers. Return rates were: principals (81%), ELP teachers (100%) and teachers (63%). The results for these groups will be discussed together, except in cases where they differed significantly.

When asked to give an overall rating of the elementary gifted program, 10% of this group indicated they had no knowledge of the program. Of the remaining 90%, the distribution of responses was as follows:

Elementary Gifted Program

Excellent/Above Average	67%
Average	26%
Below Average/Poor	7%

Ratings of the junior high and senior high programs are provided separately for each group since the groups differed significantly in their responses to these items. Percentages for the ratings do not include those who responded that they had no knowledge of the program.

Junior High Gifted Program

	Teachers	Principals	ELP Teachers	Overall
Excellent/Above Average	48%	13%	33%	42%
Average	33%	62%	50%	39%
Below Average/ Poor	19%	25%	17%	20%
No Knowledge of Program	70%	67%	14%	66%

Senior High Gifted Program

	Teachers	Principals	ELP Teachers	Overall
Excellent/Above Average	50%	50%	44%	44%
Average	36%	33%	44%	37%
Below Average/ Poor	14%	17%	11%	14%
No Knowledge of Program	84%	75%	36%	80%

Overall, the elementary gifted program is rated more highly than the junior high and senior high programs. However, it should be kept in mind that 66% of the total group claimed to have no knowledge of the junior high programs, and 80% claimed to have no knowledge of the high school program.

Thirty-nine percent of the group believed the gifted program should begin in grades K-2, 55% in grades 3-6, and 7% in grades 7-12. Regarding the type of gifted program which was preferred at each level, the following responses were obtained:

	Elementary	Jr. High	Sr. High
Acceleration	2%	6%	18%
Enrichment	32%	14%	8%
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	15%	29%	36%
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	51%	51%	39%

For all three levels the highest preference was for enrichment with some acceleration, but the pattern shifts for the second preference with enrichment for the elementary program, but emphasis in acceleration with some enrichment for the junior high and high school programs.

When asked to rank their preferences for five organizations based on time and location in a gifted program, the teacher and administrator responses revealed the following preferences:

Rank

1 Resource program - 1 full day per week pullout program.

2 Resource program - 1 to 2 hours per day pullout program.

3 Self-contained - 5 full days per week with teacher of the gifted.

4 After school program - 1-3 hours per week after school.

5 Five full days per week in a special school.

The teacher/administrator groups did not differ significantly.

Responses to the question concerning which opportunities are appropriate for gifted children are given below. The results of this item were not analyzed by computer, and thus, statistical significance among the three responding groups was not determined.

	Teachers	Principals	ELP Teachers
Early admission to:			
Kindergarten	24%	29%	69%
Junior High	29%	50%	54%
High School	43%	62%	69%
College	53%	83%	69%
Grade Skipping	35%	38%	62%
Advanced Placement	69%	50%	92%
Out of Grade Level Classes	71%	83%	92%
Acceleration by Subject in any Subject Area	71%	83%	100%
High School Credit for College Classes	61%	79%	92%

	Teachers	Principals	ELP Teachers
High School Credit for K-8 Students taking High School Classes	53%	75%	92%
Independent Studies	96%	92%	100%
Small Group Studies	92%	83%	100%
Field Trips	80%	83%	92%

Teachers of the gifted were more likely than the other groups to check the opportunities as appropriate.

Table 4 contains a list of the ten most positive Likert items. Half of these deal with benefits that students gain from being in the gifted program, two with program requirements, and the others are miscellaneous. Though the overall response to item 51 was favorable, the ELP teachers' responses were not high (36%). Negative items are listed in Table 5. Again, there appears to be no pattern to these. Table 6 contains 15 items on which teachers, principals, and ELP teachers differed significantly. In most cases, ELP teachers were the most positive of the three groups. However, a few specific items (22, 23, 26, and 51) did not follow this pattern and should be examined more closely.

TABLE 4

TEN MOST POSITIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*			
	Elem. Teachers	Elem. Principals	ELP Teachers	Overall
18. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	91	96	100	92
35. Principals demonstrate support for the gifted program.	81	96	86	83
37. I feel that gifted children should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while receiving gifted instruction.	70	88	86	73
38. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the regular class.	81	84	93	82
44. The gifted program helps gifted children communicate their ideas.	64	80	93	67
45. The gifted program helps gifted children become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	70	88	100	74
46. The gifted program has provided opportunities for gifted children to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested.	76	80	100	78
47. The gifted program provides opportunities for gifted children to develop new interests.	81	88	100	83
48. Gifted children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	67	76	100	70
51. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	74	56	36	70

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 5

FIVE MOST NEGATIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*			
	Elem. Teachers	Elem. Principals	ELP Teachers	Overall
24. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment, or a combination of acceleration and enrichment.	48	25	36	44
25. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	33	32	50	34
32. There are too many students in the gifted class for adequate instruction.	12	4	71	15
36. I feel that gifted children should complete any work that was missed while receiving gifted instruction.	28	8	7	24
49. Gifted children perform better in the regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	31	16	71	32

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 6

LIKERT ITEMS ON TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM ON WHICH THE GROUPS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY

Item	Percent Who Agree*			
	Elem. Teachers	Elem. Principal	ELP Teachers	Overall
21. Gifted children are placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	44	62	79	48
22. Parents are provided an adequate explanation of their child's test results for gifted placement.	48	80	50	52
23. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	44	56	14	43
25. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	33	32	50	34
26. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	52	32	29	48
27. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	32	68	86	40
31. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available for parent conferences.	51	80	100	58
32. There are too many students in the gifted class for adequate instruction.	12	4	71	15
40. The individual needs of gifted children are being met in the gifted program.	41	52	64	44
43. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of the needs of others.	22	32	93	28
48. Gifted children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	67	76	100	70
49. Gifted children perform better in the regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	31	16	71	32
51. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	74	56	36	70

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 6 (cont.)

Item	Percent Who Agree *			
	Elem. Teachers	Elem. Principals	ELP Teachers	Overall
53. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in gifted classes are relevant.	53	80	100	59
55. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	26	52	79	33

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

70

In addition to looking at the Likert items with respect to the top ten, and those which received differential responses, the Likert items were subdivided into six areas: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities, and Program Benefits. As discussed previously, overall means were found for five of the areas, with Program Considerations being the exception. (See Appendix C.)

Under Program Considerations, the teachers/administrators strongly agreed that a need exists for services or programs beyond the regular classroom for gifted children. They also agreed that a student should demonstrate mastery on the basic subjects prior to being allowed in the gifted program. They responded that the child gifted in one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas. The teachers/administrators also felt that children have been allowed to progress in the regular classroom through concepts as they were mastered. They agreed that the children should be responsible only for nonmastered concepts missed while they received gifted instruction; thus, they strongly disagreed that students should complete any work that was missed. The teachers'/administrators' response to the type of program for elementary, junior, and senior high being the same was definitely in the undecided area with a mean of 2.99. In response to whether the amount of time per week children spend in the program is sufficient, this group responded with a mean of 2.71, again in the undecided category, but on the positive side of the midpoint.

On the remaining five areas, the overall means fell in the agree category for three of the areas and in the undecided category for two. The overall mean for Program Placement was 2.61. All four items fell in the undecided category, with the means falling between 2.89 and 2.51. As can be seen, however, all means were on the positive side of the midpoint. Concerning this group's perception of the criteria for qualification, time taken to place a student, and the explanation of the test results to the parents, all means were fairly positive, falling near the agree category.

For the area, Classroom Expectations, the overall mean was 2.43, indicating a positive response to the expectations of the classroom. The mean response to three of the seven items fell into the agree area and six of the means fell into the positive range, with one mean being negative. This group was positive concerning the amount of support demonstrated by the principal and the ability of the gifted children to keep up with the assignments in the regular class. They also were positive concerning the ability of the gifted children to keep up with the assignments in the gifted program. The other three items which fell into the positive range but in a no opinion category were directed toward the sharing of program goals and objectives with classroom teachers, the adequacy of the grading procedures in gifted classes, and the preparation of elementary students to enter the junior high gifted program. They were somewhat negative about class size.

The overall mean for the three items measuring Communication was 2.38. The teachers/administrators were positive concerning the availability of the teachers of the gifted for parent conferences and the cooperation between classroom teachers and the teachers of the gifted for parent conferences and the cooperation between classroom teachers and the teachers of the gifted. This group was also positive toward the communication between the teachers of the gifted and the parents concerning the child's progress, but were somewhat less positive toward this item than the other two.

Facilities was the second area which fell into a no opinion category with a mean of 2.82. The teachers/administrators viewed the adequacy of the instructional facilities with a no opinion response of 3.00. This group was more positive concerning the adequacy of transportation, but still the mean was 2.65, again falling into the undecided category.

The area of Program Benefits, as with the area Communication, received positive responses with overall means of 2.38. Only four of the fourteen items did not receive an agree response. These items were directed toward whether or not the program helped children become aware of the needs of others, whether the child performed better in the regular classroom as a result of the participation in the gifted program, whether or not the needs of gifted children are being met in the gifted program, and whether or not the gifted program adequately motivates the gifted child. The first two of these items had means of 2.95 and 3.06, respectively. The latter two items had means more positive with values of 2.54 and 2.60. The means to the remaining items were positive and fell in the agree category. For example, the mean concerning the opportunities for gifted children to develop new interests was 1.98 and the mean response concerning the opportunities for gifted children to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which they are particularly skilled or interested was 2.06. The group felt the benefits to the children participating in the ELP program included the variety of subjects in the gifted classes, the opportunity to become aware of their capabilities, the developing of and maintaining a positive personal perception, enhancement of communication of their ideas, and problem solving and critical thinking skill enhancement. They were also positive toward areas that are inherent to the program. This group felt that gifted children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom, and the enrichment activities provided are relevant. They also felt enrichment activities provided the same students in regular classes were relevant.

Student Survey

This student sample included all students who had been in the elementary gifted program in 1980-81 and 1981-82. Surveys were returned from 604 of these students. This represented a return rate of 80% of those who are still in elementary school and 73% of those who are now in junior high.

In their overall rating of the elementary gifted program, students were very positive. Their responses were: Excellent/ Above Average (84%), Average (13%), and Below Average/Poor (3%).

Eighty-eight percent of the students sampled are currently enrolled in the gifted program. However, elementary and junior high students differed significantly on this item: 92% of the elementary students are in gifted, while only 82% of the junior high students are in the gifted program. The two groups also differed according to length of time spent in the gifted program. Over half of the elementary students have been in the gifted program for one or two years, while over 60% of the junior high students have been in the program for four or more years.

Table 7 lists the ten most positive items from the student survey. Most of these items deal with skills the students have learned or benefits they have gained from the gifted program. The five most negative items are listed in Table 8. Two deal with regular classroom assignments and two with how gifted students feel they are treated. There were six items, listed in Table 9, on which elementary and junior high students differed significantly. Two of these items (#16 and #19) are not positive-negative items. On the other four, elementary students were more positive than junior high students.

As with the other groups, the student responses to the Likert items were also considered as they map to given areas: Program Considerations, Classroom Expectations, and Program Benefits. The students were not asked to respond to items under the areas, Program Placement, Communication, and Facilities. (See Appendix C.)

Under Program Considerations, the students agree that they are able to keep up with assignments in the regular classroom. Almost as high a positive response was made to the item concerning spending more time in an ELP class. Students also felt that they should not be responsible for work missed in the regular classroom that they already understand. A response which fell in the no opinion category was given to the item concerning whether the teacher expects them to complete work they already understand when they return from the ELP classroom. The students' response as to whether or not they were treated better by their regular classroom teacher because they are in the ELP program fell in the no opinion category, on the negative side of the midpoint. The students disagreed to the items concerning whether or not they

TABLE 7

TEN MOST POSITIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON STUDENT SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Elementary Students	Jr. High Students	Overall
4. The activities in my ELP class are challenging to me.	85	80	83
5. The ELP program has helped me become better in problem solving and critical thinking.	87	83	85
6. I have learned independent research skills in my ELP classes.	91	87	90
14. My teacher in the ELP class encourages me to create original ideas or products.	92	87	90
15. I have adequate opportunities to work independently in my ELP class.	88	85	87
16. I think my ELP teacher is fair when she/he evaluates my work.	85	83	85
17. I have been introduced to many different subjects in my ELP class.	91	88	90
22. I am able to keep up with assignments in my regular class.	78	83	80
23. The ELP program has allowed me to learn about the subjects in which I am particularly interested.	80	75	78
25. The ELP program has helped me become aware of my capabilities.	82	77	80

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 8

FIVE MOST NEGATIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON STUDENT SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Elementary Students	Jr. High Students	Overall
8. I use what I have learned in my ELP class in everyday situations.	56	46	52
11. I am treated better by other students because I am in the ELP program.	24	16	21
12. I am treated better by my regular classroom teachers because I am in the ELP program.	23	26	24
19. My regular classroom teachers expect me to complete work that I already understand when I return from my ELP class.	38	60	46
20. I feel that I should be responsible for all work missed in my regular classes when I am in my ELP class.	19	26	22

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 9

LIKERT ITEMS ON STUDENT SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM ON WHICH THE GROUPS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY

Item	Percent Who Agree		
	Elementary Students	Jr. High Students	Overall
9. Being in an ELP class has given me greater self-confidence.	77	60	71
10. I enjoy school more when I am in the ELP program.	76	59	70
13. I wish I could spend more time in the ELP class.	73	45	63
18. There are too many students in the ELP classes for good instruction.	13	23	17
19. My regular classroom teachers expect me to complete work that I already understand when I return from my ELP class.	38	60	46
24. I have developed new interests as a result of being in the ELP program.	81	67	76

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

are treated better by students because they are in the ELP program and also that they should be responsible for all work missed in their regular class when they attend the ELP program.

The mean response by students under Classroom Expectations was 2.00. Taking a negative response to class size as its complement in the positive direction, the students were positive toward the evaluation of their work by the ELP teacher and with respect to the number of students in the ELP classrooms. The response of the students to the area of Program Benefits was also positive with an overall mean of 2.00. Only two items fell into the no opinion category with a mean of 2.53 for the students' responses to the use of what they learn in the ELP class in everyday situations and a mean of 2.87 to the question of whether they have increased their reading since being in the ELP program. The item directed toward their awareness of the needs of others as a result of the ELP program had a mean of 2.45, just falling into the agree area. The responses to all other items under Program Benefits were very positive. It appears the students feel that activities in the ELP program challenge them, they are better in problem solving and critical thinking, they learn research skills, etc.

Comments Concerning the Elementary ELP Program

When summarizing open comments, care must be taken not to overgeneralize, since not all respondents make comments. However, they provide a valuable source of information since respondents can give their own input. Therefore, open comments will be briefly summarized in this section, and a more detailed listing by subgroups is included in Appendix D.

A majority of the comments fell into several broad areas: positive comments about the program in general; comments concerning activities and subjects that are or should be provided; and comments concerning program policies and management, including budget, facilities, transportation, time spent in program, identification and placement, communication, coordination, and monitoring.

Of the total parent group responding to this survey, 83% made comments. Following is a list of the comments most often made by parents concerning the elementary program:

- Positive comments about the program in general
- Better communication needed between parents and teachers
- Broaden scope of subjects offered
- More field trips should be offered
- Need better transition between elementary and junior high programs
- Preparation for transition is adequate

Considering the group of elementary teachers, principals, and ELP teachers combined, 46% of this group made comments. The most common comment made by elementary teachers was that better communication is needed between teachers and parents, and the next comment most often made was that testing procedures need to be changed. ELP teachers also commented that testing and screening of students needs to be improved. In addition, they felt that more supplies and equipment are needed. Elementary principals most often commented on expanding the program to serve all identified students and providing space at each school for the program.

Of the total student group responding to the survey, 94% made comments. Following are the comments made most often:

- Positive comments about the program in general
- Students want more time in the program
- Students like the independent studies and field trips
- Students want a greater variety of subjects based on their personal interests

Again, the reader is referred to Appendix D for a more detailed listing of comments made by the various subgroups.

Junior High Gifted Program

Parent Survey

Surveys concerning the junior high gifted program were sent to 747 parents. Two hundred ninety-six were returned, for a return rate of 40%. Data on junior high gifted students, whose parents completed the surveys indicated that 38% of the students were male and 62% female. This difference between male and female is based upon parent return rate.

The responding parents rated the Mesa gifted program at each level as follows:

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High
Excellent/Above Average	62%	59%	58%
Average	30%	30%	29%
Below Average/Poor	7%	12%	13%

Approximately 60% of the parents rated the program above average or excellent. The overall rating is slightly higher for the elementary program, but there is no great disparity among the three levels.

Responses to the item dealing with when the gifted program should begin indicated the following preferences:

Kindergarten	30%	Fourth	11%
First	16%	Fifth	4%
Second	12%	Sixth	2%
Third	20%	Seventh	4%
		Eighth	1%

Therefore, nearly 60% of the junior high parents believe the program should begin earlier than it now does.

Parents indicated the following preferences for type of gifted program at each level:

	Elementary	Jr. High	Sr. High
Acceleration	4	4	3
Enrichment	2	3	4
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	3	2	1
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	1	1	2

Parents' preferences shifted somewhat across levels, although not dramatically.

With regard to location and time spent in gifted classes, parents ranked the five possible organizations in the following order:

Rank	
1	Resource program - 1 to 2 hours per day pullout program.
2	Self-contained - 5 full days per week with teacher of the gifted.
3	Resource program - 1 full day per week pullout program.
4	After school program - 1-3 hours per week after school hours.
5	Five full days per week in a special school.

Given a list of activities, the parents checked the following as being appropriate for gifted students:

		Percent of total population who believed each activity to be appropriate
Early admission to:	Kindergarten	31%
	Junior High	31%
	High School	40%
	College	53%
Acceleration by subject in any subject area		80%
Field trips		78%
High school credit for college classes		77%
Independent studies		77%
Small group studies		75%
Out of grade level classes		72%
Advanced placement		68%
High school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes		67%
Grade skipping		26%

Again, these reflect a preference for enrichment or a combination of enrichment and acceleration in some classes, but not just acceleration.

Table 10 contains a list of the ten most positive Likert items. These items deal with areas such as general satisfaction with the program, benefits the children receive, and requirements for being in the gifted program. Table 11 contains the five most negative Likert items from the parent survey. These items deal with various aspects of the program. Listed in Table 12 are four Likert items on which there was a significant difference between parent groups. On all four items, parents of students

TABLE 10

TEN MOST POSITIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON PARENT SURVEY OF JR. HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Jr. High Parents	Sr. High Parents	Overall
14. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	96	92	95
37. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in his/her regular class.	92	90	91
38. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	94	87	91
39. My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	90	84	87
40. I have been pleased with my child's experiences in the gifted program.	88	81	85
43. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of his/her capabilities.	85	73	80
47. The gifted classes have helped my child become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	85	73	80
50. My child is intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	80	82	80
53. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	75	76	76
54. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	79	85	82

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 11

FIVE MOST NEGATIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON PARENT SURVEY OF JR. HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Jr. High Parents	Sr. High Parents	Overall
16. The goals and objectives of the Mesa Gifted Programs are clearly defined.	42	32	38
19. I received an adequate explanation of my child's placement test results.	52	44	48
23. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	41	28	34
24. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	29	24	27
36. I feel that my child should complete any work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	37	49	42

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 12

LIKERT ITEMS ON PARENT SURVEY OF JR. HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM ON WHICH THE GROUPS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Jr. High Parents	Sr. High Parents	Overall
18. My child was placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	62	44	54
44. The gifted program has helped my child develop and/or maintain a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	84	67	76
46. The gifted program has helped my child communicate his/her ideas.	84	67	77
47. The gifted classes have helped my child become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	85	73	80

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

who are still in junior high were more positive than parents of students who are now in high school.

As noted previously, the Likert items were further subdivided into six areas: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities and Program Benefits. Overall means were found for five of the areas, Program Considerations being the exception.

Under Program Considerations the parents strongly agreed that a need exists for services or programs beyond the regular curriculum for gifted children. They also agreed that a student should demonstrate mastery on the basic subjects prior to being allowed in the gifted program. They responded a child gifted in one or two areas should be served by the gifted program in those areas. The parents were undecided concerning whether their child has been allowed to progress in the regular classroom with concepts as they were mastered. They were also undecided concerning whether or not their child should be responsible only for nonmastered concepts and in addition should complete any work that was missed while he or she was receiving gifted instruction. The parents' response to the type of program for elementary, junior and senior high being the same was slightly above the 2.5 response which placed it in the undecided category. In response to the amount of time per week children spend in the program, parents were undecided concerning the part-time program, but when reworded to ask if the time in gifted classes was sufficient parents agreed.

On the remaining five areas the overall mean fell in the agree category on three of the areas and in the undecided but positive area on the remaining two. The overall mean for Program Placement was 2.63. The mean response to all items was positive but only the means concerning the criteria the students had to meet to qualify for the program and the placement within 60 days of identification fell in the agree category. The parents were less positive to the items concerning information on the criteria needed to qualify for the gifted program, the accuracy of the explanation of the child's placement test and the testing services for the gifted program.

For the area Classroom Expectations the overall mean was 2.48, indicating a positive response of the parents to their expectations for the classroom. The mean response to five of the eight items fell in the agree area, with all means in the positive range. The three items which received means in the undecided category were concerned with the goals and objectives being clearly defined, too many students for adequate instruction, and the expectations of the regular classroom teacher concerning work that was missed by the student while receiving gifted instruction. Concerning the other five items, the parents were positive concerning their child's ability to keep up with assignments, both in the regular class and in the gifted class. They felt that the students are prepared to enter junior high. Parents also felt the teachers were qualified to teach gifted children and the grading procedure was adequate in the gifted classes.

The overall mean for the three items measuring Communication was in the agree category with a positive 2.46. The parents felt very positive when queried whether or not teachers of the gifted classroom were available for conferences. They were also positive concerning the cooperation between classroom teachers and the teachers of the gifted. They were positive concerning the

the information they received on their children's progress in the gifted class, but the mean response fell in a no opinion category.

The other area that fell into a no opinion category with a mean of 2.92 was Facilities. The parents viewed the adequacy of the instructional facilities and the adequacy of transportation with an identical mean of 2.92.

The area of Program Benefits received the highest positive response with an overall mean of 2.26. Only three of the 16 items did not fall into an agree category. These received positive responses but the means fell in the no opinion range. These items were directed toward sufficiency in the variety of subjects offered in the gifted classes, whether or not the child exhibited positive changes at home as a result of the gifted program and whether or not the gifted program helped the child become more aware of the needs of others. The mean responses to the 13 remaining items all fell in the agree category, ranging from a mean of 2.45 to 1.80. For example, the children's enjoyment of the program had a mean of 1.80 and the parents being pleased with the child's experiences in the gifted program a mean of 1.94. The parents viewed the benefits to their children as, being intellectually challenged, increasing their awareness of their capabilities, and developing a positive perception of themselves. The parents were also positive toward areas that are inherent in the program. They felt that the program motivates the child, helps their communication skills, helps their critical thinking skills, gives them the opportunity to delve more deeply into subjects that interest them and that the enrichment activities are relevant.

Parents whose children had once participated in the gifted program but do so no longer checked the following reasons for withdrawal:

Difficulties in the gifted program	10%
Graduated out of the program	37%
Did not benefit from gifted involvement	11%
Teacher pressure in regular classes	3%
Unable to "keep up" with assignments in regular classes	6%
Missing out on too many activities in regular classes	7%
Other (please specify):	27%

For the most part, reasons listed under "other" were related to the broad reasons given. Primarily they dealt with: general dissatisfaction, "excessive" workload, or the lack of a program.

Junior high parents first learned about Mesa's Gifted Program from the following sources: teacher (41%), school (37%), other (19%) and parent (3%). They indicated that they received most of their information about gifted children from the following sources: magazines and newsletters (40%), parent/teacher conferences (33%), school personnel (22%), and workshops about gifted (6%). Slightly over half of the parents indicated that they had never visited the gifted class. Nearly 40% indicated they had visited the class one to five times. Of those who visited the class, 69% indicated it had increased their understanding of the program, 14% that it had not, and 17% were undecided. When asked who they contact most frequently about the gifted program, parents responded: teacher of gifted classes (57%), regular classroom teacher (24%), school administration (14%), Mesa Parents Association of Gifted and Talented (4%), and school board (1%). When asked to rate their involvement in Mesa's Gifted Program. responses were: a great deal (2%), moderately (10%), and not very much (88%).

Teacher and Administrator Survey

The sample for this survey consisted of all junior and senior high principals and assistant principals, 1/3 of the junior high teachers, and all junior high ELP teachers. Return rates were: junior high principals (67%), high school principals (59%), junior high teachers (73%), and junior high ELP teachers (92%). Again, the results for these groups will be discussed together, except in cases where they differed significantly.

Following are the results of the overall rating of the gifted program at each level. They are presented for each group separately at the elementary and high school levels since the groups differed significantly in rating those programs. The reader is reminded that percentages for each rating do not include those who indicated they had no knowledge of the program.

Elementary Gifted Program

	J.H. Teach.	J.H. Prin.	H.S. Prin.	ELP J.H. Teach.	Overall
Excellent/Above Average	50%	67%	50%	25%	49%
Average	38%	11%	50%	75%	39%
Below Average/Poor	12%	22%	--	--	11%
No Knowledge of Program	62%	18%	60%	33%	57%

Junior High Gifted Program

	Overall
Excellent/Above Average	38%
Average	43%
Below Average/Poor	19%
No Knowledge of Program	23%

High School Gifted Program

	J.H. Teach.	J.H. Prin.	H.S. Prin.	ELP J.H. Teach.	Overall
Excellent/Above Average	35%	62%	50%	57%	44%
Average	57%	38%	40%	29%	48%
Below Average/Poor	8%	0%	10%	14%	8%
No Knowledge of Program	72%	27%	0%	42%	62%

The group as a whole was most positive about the elementary program and least positive about the junior high program. It should be kept in mind, however, that over half of the group indicated that they had no knowledge of the elementary or high school programs.

Forty-two percent of the group believed the gifted program should begin in grades K, 1, or 2, 41% in grades 3-6, and 17% in grades 7-12. With respect to type of gifted program, the group showed the following preferences for each level:

	Elementary	Jr. High	Sr. High
Acceleration	6%	7%	31%
Enrichment	40%	28%	15%
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	14%	24%	33%
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	39%	40%	21%

The data show that this group favored enrichment or emphasis on enrichment at the elementary and junior high levels, and shifted to preference for acceleration at the high school level.

Regarding preferences for organization based on time and location in a gifted program, the following rank was obtained:

Rank	
1	Resource program - 1 to 2 hours per day pullout program.
2	Resource program - 1 full day per week pullout program.
3	Self-contained - 5 full days per week with teacher of the gifted.
4	After school program - 1-3 hours per week after school hours.
5	Five full days per week in a special school.

Differences between this group and the parent group will be discussed in the summary section.

When asked to check opportunities which are appropriate for gifted children, responses were as follows:

	Jr. High Teachers	Jr. High & Sr. High Principals	ELP Teachers
Early admission to;			
Kindergarten	33%	28%	46%
Junior High	45%	36%	54%
High School	50%	36%	62%
College	67%	60%	77%
Grade skipping	39%	44%	46%
Advanced placement	78%	84%	100%
Out of grade level classes	75%	68%	92%
Acceleration by subject in any subject area	81%	72%	92%

	Jr. High Teachers	Jr. High & Sr. High Principals	ELP Teachers
High school credit for college classes	68%	44%	69%
High school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes	61%	40%	62%
Independent studies	91%	80%	77%
Small group studies	79%	64%	92%
Field trips	74%	68%	92%

Again, teachers of the gifted were most likely to check the opportunities as appropriate, although tests for statistical significance were not performed.

Table 13 contains a list of the ten most positive Likert items on this survey. These items deal with ELP teachers, principals, ability of students to keep up with assignments, benefits to students, and requirements for entering the program. It should be noted that some of these items, athough they are among the ten highest, are not extremely positive. The five most negative items are listed in Table 14. These items deal with varying aspects of the program. There were 23 Likert items, listed in Table 15, on which the four groups differed significantly. A general trend on these items is that principals are most positive, followed by ELP teachers, with regular classroom teachers being least positive, although this is not true for all items. In some cases, the ELP teachers were the most positive.

TABLE 13

TEN MOST POSITIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY OF JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*				
	J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	ELP Teach.	Overall
18. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	91	100	100	100	93
31. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available for parent conferences.	38	100	90	83	49
35. Principals demonstrate support for the gifted program.	57	100	70	75	62
38. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the regular class.	70	100	80	83	74
39. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	52	100	70	100	60
44. The gifted program helps gifted children communicate their ideas.	46	100	100	83	56
45. The gifted program helps gifted children become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	49	91	70	83	56
47. The gifted program provides opportunities for gifted children to develop new interests.	48	91	90	91	56
51. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	78	54	80	67	76
52. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	78	73	90	100	80

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 14

FIVE MOST NEGATIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY OF JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*				
	J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	ELP Teach.	Overall
19. The district goals and objectives for the Mesa Gifted Program have been shared with classroom teachers.	16	50	50	25	21
24. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment, or a combination of acceleration and enrichment.	39	42	40	67	42
25. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	20	58	50	25	25
26. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	12	67	30	8	17
43. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of the needs of others.	14	46	40	42	19

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 15

LIKERT ITEMS ON TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY OF JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM ON WHICH GROUPS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY

Item	Percent Who Agree*				
	J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	ELP Teach.	Overall
19. The district goals and objectives for the Mesa Gifted Program have been shared with classroom teachers.	16	50	50	25	21
20. The criteria gifted children have to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	34	92	70	67	43
21. Gifted children are placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	17	67	30	42	23
22. Parents are provided an adequate explanation of their child's test results for gifted placement.	27	67	50	42	32
23. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	25	50	60	25	30
25. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	20	58	50	25	25
26. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	12	67	30	8	17
27. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	24	83	40	64	32
31. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available for parent conferences.	38	100	90	83	49
32. There are too many students in the gifted class for adequate instruction.	16	25	20	73	21
33. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep parents adequately informed of their child's progress.	24	92	40	75	33
34. Cooperation between regular classroom teachers and the teacher of the gifted is good.	34	92	50	50	40

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 15 (cont.)

Item	Percent Who Agree*				
	J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	ELP Teach.	Overall
35. Principals demonstrate support for the gifted program.	57	100	70	75	62
36. I feel that gifted children should complete work that was missed while receiving gifted instruction.	58	17	20	33	51
39. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	52	100	70	100	60
41. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of their capabilities.	45	91	90	92	54
43. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of the needs of others.	14	46	40	42	19
44. The gifted program helps gifted children communicate their ideas.	46	100	100	83	56
47. The gifted program provides opportunities for gifted children to develop new interests.	48	91	90	91	56
48. Gifted children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	41	91	70	100	50
49. Gifted children perform better in the regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	19	18	60	67	25
53. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in gifted classes are relevant.	35	82	60	75	42
55. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	16	9	56	42	20

In addition to looking at the Likert items with respect to those which received the most positive and negative responses and those which received differential responses, the Likert items were subdivided into six areas: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities, and Program Benefits. As discussed previously, overall means were found for five of the areas with Program Considerations being the exception (see Appendix C).

Under Program Considerations, the teachers/administrators strongly agreed that a need exists for services or program beyond the regular classroom for gifted children. They also agreed that a student should demonstrate mastery on the basic subjects prior to being allowed in the gifted program. They responded that a child gifted in one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas. The mean responses to the remaining five items fell in the no opinion category. These items were directed toward the similarity between programs at the elementary, junior, and senior high levels, the amount of time per week that a student should spend in gifted classes, whether or not the gifted children should complete any work that was missed while receiving gifted instruction, the student's responsibility for nonmastered concepts in the regular classroom and whether or not the gifted children were allowed to progress through concepts as they were mastered in the regular classroom.

On the remaining five areas the overall means fell in the no opinion category for all areas. The overall mean for Program Placement is 2.76. All four items fell in the undecided category with the means falling between 2.64 and 2.93. As can be seen, however, all means were on the positive side of the midpoint. In terms of relative positive order the teachers/administrators viewed criterion for qualification, explanation of test results to parents, duration prior to placement and adequacy of testing services as positive.

For the area Classroom Expectations, the overall mean was 2.83, again indicating a no opinion response to the expectations of the classroom. The mean response to two of the five items fell into the agree category. These items concerned the principals's demonstration of support for the gifted program and the ability of the gifted students to keep up with assignments in the gifted program. Two of the items fell into the negative range. The mean response concerning the item directed toward the sharing of the gifted goals and objectives of the gifted program with classroom teachers received a mean of 3.54. The mean response to the item concerning the preparation of elementary students to enter the junior high gifted program was 3.01. The response to class size fell in the no opinion category.

The overall mean for the three items measuring Communication was 2.64, indicating an undecided or no opinion response. The teachers/administrators were positive on all three items but only one of the items received an overall agree response. This item was directed toward the availability of the teachers of the gifted for parent conferences. Where the teachers and administrators were queried concerning keeping parents adequately informed of their children's progress and the cooperation between classroom teachers and the teachers of the gifted, they responded with an undecided or no opinion response.

The overall mean for Facilities was 3.06 falling into the negative range. The teachers/administrators viewed the adequacy of the instructional facilities with a negative 3.12 response. This group was also negative concerning the adequacy of transportation with a mean of 3.01. Both of these means fell in an undecided or no response category.

The area of Program Benefits also fell into an undecided or no opinion area with an overall mean of 2.63. Of the 14 items mapping to Program Benefits all but one received means that were positive. Considering whether or not the mean responses fell in an agree or no opinion category, the 14 items were evenly divided with seven means in the agree category and seven in the undecided. The items which received means smaller than 2.50, those that fell in the agree category, were directed toward the students' becoming aware of their capabilities, the development of positive perceptions, the assistance gained in communication of their ideas, the increase in proficiency in problem solving and critical thinking, the opportunity to pursue in greater depth subjects in which they were particularly skilled and more interested in, the development of new interests and the intellectual challenge that the students received in the gifted classroom. Those items which received a positive response but fell in a no opinion category were directed toward the variety of subjects offered in the gifted class, the motivation received, the meeting of individual needs, the relevance of the enrichment activities in the gifted classroom, the relevance of enrichment activities in the regular classroom and the increase in performance in the regular classroom as a result of participation in the gifted class. The one item which received a negative response of 3.13 was directed toward the gifted student awareness of the needs of others as a result of being in the gifted program.

Following is a ranking of reasons for student withdrawal from the gifted program:

Rank	
1	Academic difficulties in gifted class.
2	Moved out of area.
3	Behavior problems in gifted class.
4	Academic difficulties in regular class.
5	Behavior problems in regular class.

The group perceived academic difficulties in gifted class to be the most common reason for withdrawal.

Student Survey

The sample for this survey included all students who were in the junior high gifted program in 1980-81 and 1981-82. Surveys were returned from 402 of these students. This represented a return rate of 77% from those who are still in junior high and 53% of those who are now in high school.

On their overall rating of the junior high gifted program, students were generally positive. Responses were: Excellent/Above Average (64%), Average (31%), and Below Average/Poor (5%).

Fifty-nine percent of the students are currently enrolled in the gifted program. However, junior high and high school students differed significantly on this item: 77% of the junior high students are in the gifted program, while only 41% of the high school students are in the gifted program. The two groups did not differ significantly on total length of time they have been in gifted. Thirty-nine percent have been in the program for one to two years, 23% for three years, and 38% for four years or more.

Table 16 lists the ten most positive Likert items on the student survey. Most of these items deal with benefits students have obtained from the gifted program. Table 17 contains the five most negative Likert items. Two of these deal with how gifted students feel they are treated by others, and the other items vary. There were three items on which junior and senior high students differed significantly (Table 18). On all three, high school students were more positive than junior high students.

As with the other groups, the student responses to the Likert items as they mapped to given areas: Program Considerations, Classroom Expectations, and Program Benefits. The students were not asked to respond to items under the areas Program Placement, Communication, and Facilities (see Appendix C).

Under Program Considerations the students agree that they are able to keep up with assignments in the regular classroom, The item concerning spending more time in the gifted class fell in the no opinion category. The remaining three items received negative responses with the item concerning being treated more favorably because they were in the gifted program receiving a disagree response with a mean of 3.59. The other two items, although receiving negative responses, fell in a no opinion category and were directed toward whether or not the student was

104

TABLE 16

TEN MOST POSITIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON
STUDENT SURVEY OF JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Jr. High Student	Sr. High Student	Overall
4. The activities in my gifted class are challenging to me.	76	85	80
5. The gifted program has helped me become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	74	83	79
6. I have learned independent research skills in my gifted class.	76	83	80
7. The gifted program has taught me skills which allow me to analyze both sides of an issue.	72	75	74
8. I have learned how to apply knowledge to practical situations in my gifted class.	68	78	73
14. My teacher in the gifted class encourages me to create original ideas or products.	78	83	80
15. I have adequate opportunities to work independently in my gifted class.	80	83	82
17. I have been exposed to a wide variety of subjects in my gifted class.	72	72	72
19. I am able to keep up with assignments in my regular classes.	85	86	86
22. The gifted program has helped me become aware of my capabilities.	74	80	77

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 17

FIVE MOST NEGATIVE LIKERT ITEMS ON STUDENT SURVEY OF JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Jr. High Student	Sr. High Student	Overall
11. I am treated more favorably by other students because I am in the gifted program.	11	13	12
13. I am treated more favorably by my regular classroom teachers because I am in the gifted program.	30	32	31
23. The gifted program has helped me become aware of the needs of others.	40	39	39
25. I spend more time reading since I have been in the gifted program.	41	40	41
27. The type of program for elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same.	26	26	26

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

TABLE 18

LIKERT ITEMS ON STUDENT SURVEY OF JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM ON WHICH GROUPS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY

Item	Percent Who Agree*		
	Jr. High Students	Sr. High Students	Overall
12. I wish I could spend more time in the gifted class.	35	44	40
18. There are too many students in the gifted classes for adequate instruction.	26	10	18
21. I have developed new interests as a result of being in the gifted program.	50	67	59

*Strongly Agree and Agree combined

treated more favorably by the classroom teacher because they were in the gifted program and whether or not the type of program for elementary, junior, and senior high should be the same.

The mean response by student for Classroom Expectations was a positive 2.41. Taking a negative response to class size as its complement in the positive direction, the students were positive toward all three items measuring Classroom Expectations. However, they were undecided concerning class size but agreed that the grading procedure used by the gifted classroom teacher was fair and that elementary students in the gifted program were academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.

The response of the students to the area Program Benefits was also positive with an overall mean of 2.29. Of the 16 items all received a mean response in the positive category. All but three fell into the agree area. The three items which received no opinion responses were directed toward whether or not the gifted program allowed the students to pursue subjects in which they were particularly interested, whether or not the program helped them become aware of the needs of others and whether or not they spent more time reading since they had been in the gifted program. The responses to all other items under Program Benefits were very positive. It appears that students feel that activities in the ELP program challenge them, they are better at problem solving and critical thinking, they learn research skills, etc.

Comments Concerning the Junior High Gifted Program

Of the combined parent subgroups responding to this survey, 77% made comments. The following comments were made most frequently:

- Better communication needed between teachers and parents
- Need better teachers
- Positive comments about the program in general
- Need to review entrance requirements, placement and testing procedures
- Better transition needed between elementary and junior high programs
- Transition between elementary and junior high is adequate

Approximately 2/3 of the teachers and principals made comments on this survey. Junior high teachers most frequently commented on the need for better communication between classroom and ELP teachers. The next most frequent comment was that entrance requirements should be limited. Both the principals and ELP teachers commented on the need for more funding and resources, and improving the testing and placement procedures. Both of the teacher groups commented that more in-service teacher training is needed. Principals also commented that the junior high program should be expanded.

Eighty-three percent of the responding students made comments. The most frequently made comments were:

- Gifted classes are challenging
- Positive comments about the program in general
- Gifted students like association with students on the same level
- Gifted students like working independently
- Need wider range of classes
- Need smaller classes

The reader is referred to Appenidx D for a more detailed listing of comments for each subgroup.

SUMMARY

Introduction

In 1974-75 a resource program for gifted students was offered in first through sixth grade at three elementary schools and one junior high school. Today all elementary schools (exception Franklin Elementary), junior high, and senior high schools are served. There are a total of approximately 692 elementary students, 469 junior high students (duplicated count), and 380 senior high students (duplicated count) compared to the total of 81 students served in 1974-75.

The elementary ELP serves students in grades 3-6 in thirteen locations throughout the district. There are 13.1 full-time equivalent teachers serving the elementary program. The elementary ELP is a resource program one day per week for each grade served.

The junior high program serves students at all eight junior high schools. In four schools (Carson, Fremont, Kino and Rhodes) both English and social studies ELP are offered. At the remaining junior high schools ELP is implemented in the core curriculum. The high schools offer an advanced placement program. This year twenty-three advanced placement courses are being taught in English calculus, American history, chemistry, physics, and biology. Both junior high and high school programs meet daily for the period the student is enrolled in the class.

Methods

The evaluation results which are documented in this report are directed toward a survey instrument which solicited the perceptions of 15 different groups. These groups were representative of parents, students, and teachers/administrators throughout the district. The parent and student groups included both parents and students that are currently involved in the program, as well as parents and students who are no longer involved in the program.

The survey instruments designed to solicit input from the 15 groups included a parent survey, a student survey and a teacher/administrator survey. Slight variations were made in the three basic surveys to incorporate the specific knowledge of the groups being sampled but a core of items were on all surveys. The survey instruments were developed by the Department of Research and Evaluation with significant input and review by parent representatives, District Gifted Program Review Committee, and administrators.

The target population determining the student and parent samples consisted of students that participated in the gifted program in the Mesa Schools during the school years 1980-81 and 1981-82. A 100% sample of all parents and students was used. Attempts were made to insure that a given family would not receive more than one survey for the elementary program or the junior high program. The same steps were taken to insure that a given student was not asked to fill out more than one survey instrument, but more than one child in a given family could respond. Concerning the sample of classroom teachers, 50% of all teachers in the district grades 3-6 were sampled. At the junior high level 50% were sampled for grades 7-9. Franklin Elementary School was not included in the sample. All administrators and teachers of the gifted were asked to respond to the gifted survey for their level, either elementary or junior high.

Results

The surveys and the method of sampling were specifically designed so that input could be gathered from different publics which it was thought might have different perceptions concerning both the elementary and junior high gifted programs. For example, students who were currently in the elementary gifted program, as well as students who graduated out of the program, were included in the sample. This also held true for the parents of these students. In the sampling for teachers/administrators, both classroom teachers as well as the ELP teachers and administrators were surveyed.

It was found that both for the elementary program and the junior high program all populations surveyed responded in a similar manner with few exceptions. Basically all groups were very positive toward each of the programs. The elementary students were more positive, however, than the junior high students; the same is true for the parents. With respect to the teacher/administrator survey, the ELP teachers tended to have more extreme responses than either the classroom teachers or the administrators. In general, if an item received a positive response, such as those Likert items dealing with the benefits of the program, the ELP teachers tended to view these as more positive than the other two groups sampled. On those items which received more negative responses, such as the adequacy of testing services or the transportation for the gifted program, the ELP teachers tended to be more negative than the other two groups.

Given the general response differences from the groups, there was relative agreement from the groups sampled. When significant differences were found, they tended to be in the degree of positiveness or negativeness to a given item. In some cases one group would favor enrichment as their number one choice and emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration as their second choice; the other group would reverse these favoring emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration as the number one choice and enrichment as the number two choice. It is felt that although the responses were significantly different, the intent of the responses was not. The one case where this did not hold true was on the item concerning whether or not elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high program. Although the elementary parents generally were more positive over items than the junior high parents, the trend was reversed on this item with the elementary parents feeling less sure that the students were prepared to enter the junior high gifted program than the junior high parents who had their child experience the transition. In the following summary of results, therefore, differences among the groups using a given survey are not addressed. Comparisons across groups on different surveys, however, are addressed.

Elementary Program

Parents

Overall, this group of parents showed positive attitudes toward Mesa's Gifted Program. Parents also indicated a preference for program types that are already being used in Mesa, for example, they indicated a preference for enrichment versus acceleration and a one full day per week pullout program versus one to two hours per day pullout program. Mesa's current gifted program utilizes these types at the elementary level. In contrast, over 60% of these parents believed the program should begin earlier than it does now. Also, 78% of the parents indicated that they were not very involved in the program. Overall, nearly 80% of the parents rated the elementary gifted program as above average or excellent. They were less positive about the junior high and senior high programs, with 56% and 31%, respectively, rating them above average or excellent.

On the 44 Likert items, those items to which the parents responded on a five-point scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, the parents' responses were again positive. All but two items on the Likert scale received a mean response in a positive range. Under Program Considerations, the parents felt most strongly about the need for a gifted program, that the students should demonstrate grade level mastery in the basic subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program, that their child(ren) should be responsible only for unmastered concepts missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction, that a child who is gifted in one or two areas should receive services in those areas, and that they were satisfied with the procedure of providing gifted instuction on a part-time basis.

The overall mean response by parents to those items mapping to Program Placement received a mean of 2.50 in the agree category. The response to all items was positive with the higher responses concerning the reasonableness of the criteria for placement and whether or not the child was placed within 60 days of identification. The lowest mean, 2.82, was received by the item concerning the explanation the parents obtained concerning the child's placement test results. The area of Classroom Expectations also received a very positive mean, 2.23. The items that received the most positive responses or had the highest positive mean were directed toward the ability of the student to keep up with both the regular and gifted classes. Another item which received a high positive response, 2.03, concerned the parents' perceptions of the qualifications of the teachers of the gifted. The item which was the least positive with a mean of 2.62 was directed toward class size.

Under the general area of Communication the parents again responded with a very positive mean of 2.14. The parents were extremely positive concerning the availability of the teachers of the gifted for conferences and also agreed that the teachers keep

116

them adequately informed of the children's progress and that there appears to be good cooperation between classroom teachers and regular teachers. The area viewed most negatively by the parents was the general area of Facilities. It, however, received a positive mean of 2.91. The parents viewed the facilities items negatively with a mean, 3.03, in the negative range. Under the general area of Program Benefits, the parents' mean score was 2.13, again very positive. The items which received the most positive responses were directed toward the child's enjoyment of the program, the parents' pleasure concerning the children's experiences, the enhancement of the child with respect to critical thinking, development of new interests and the challenge experienced in these gifted classes. Two areas that were somewhat lower than the others but still positive were directed toward whether or not the gifted program helped the student become aware of the needs of others and whether the program helped them perform better in their regular classroom.

Teachers and Principals

It is difficult to present an overall summary of the results from this group since teachers, principals, and ELP teachers often differed in their opinions. However, they were consistent in preferring a program with emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration, and organized as a one full day per week pullout program. Generally they were in agreement that enrichment opportunities such as independent studies, small group studies, and field trips are appropriate for gifted students. They were less consistent in their opinions concerning the appropriateness of such opportunities as early admission, grade skipping, and advanced placement. Thirty-nine percent of the group believed the gifted program should begin in grades K-2, while 55% believed it should begin in grades 3-6. Overall, two-thirds of this group rated the elementary program as above average or excellent, and another 26% rated it as average. The three subgroups differed significantly in their ratings of the junior and senior high gifted programs, and generally their ratings were lower for these levels than for the elementary program.

The teachers/administrators responded positively to all but three items on the 38 item Likert scale. Under Program Considerations the teachers/administrators did not agree that the students should complete any classroom work missed while receiving gifted instruction. They responded most positively to the need for a gifted program. They also felt that a student should demonstrate mastery in the basic subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program. Under the general area of Program Placement, the teachers'/administrators'overall mean was positive, 2.61, but would fall under the operational definition in the no opinion area. In fact, all of the four items mapping to this area fell in the no opinion category, but on the positive side of the midpoint, 3.00. Under Classroom Expectations this group had an overall mean in the agree category of 2.43. They were most positive concerning agreement that the principal demonstrated support for the gifted program and that the students were able to keep up both in the regular class and in the gifted class. The area which received the lowest mean score, 2.71, under this given area was in response to the adequacy of the grading procedure used in the gifted class. Communication received a positive mean of 2.38 with the availability of the teachers for parent conferences receiving the highest response. Cooperation between classroom and gifted teachers was also viewed positively with a mean of 2.35. The area of Facilities fell in a positive range with a mean of 2.82, but the instructional facilities was viewed in the middle with a mean of 3.00 and transportation was viewed with a mean of 2.65.

The area of Program Benefits received an overall mean of 2.38, in the agree range. The item which fell into the negative end of the scale with a mean of 3.06 was directed toward whether or not a child performs better in the regular class after participation in the gifted program. The other item with a relative low mean of 2.95 was whether or not the gifted program helps students become aware of the needs of others. The responses to the opportunity to develop new ideas and the opportunity to pursue in greater depth subjects in which they were particularly skilled or interested and the enhancement of problem solving skills and critical thinking were those items which received the highest positive response.

Students

Overall, students were very positive about the elementary program, with 84% rating it as above average or excellent. Many of the items about which they were most positive dealt with benefits they have gained from the program. The negative items dealt with how they are treated by others and classroom assignments. Ninety-two percent of the elementary students are still in the gifted program, and 82% of those previously in the elementary program are now in the junior high gifted program.

On the Likert items under Program Considerations, the students agreed that they were able to keep up assignments in the regular classroom and they also wished that they could spend more time in the ELP class. At the opposite end they did not feel that they should make up all the work missed while they were in the ELP class, nor did they feel that they were treated better by the other students or the classroom teacher because they were in the ELP program. Under Classroom Expectations the overall mean response by students was a very positive 2.00. The response to both items fell into the agree range. For Program Benefits, the mean was again 2.00. The responses to almost all of the items fell into an agree category with the exceptions being the response to whether or not they spend more time reading since being in the ELP program and whether or not they used what they learn in the ELP program in everyday situations. They were extremely positive concerning learning of independent research skills, being introduced to different subjects and the opportunity to learn more about subjects that they are particularly interested in. Their awareness of their capabilities as a result of participating in the ELP program was also positive.

Comparison Across Groups

This section will contain a brief summary of those items from the elementary survey which were considered to be especially important and/or common to two or more of the groups surveyed. Comparing the parent and teacher/administrator groups on preference for program type, the following results can be seen at each level:

Elementary Program

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
Acceleration	4	4
Enrichment	1	2
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	3	3
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	2	1

Junior High Program

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
Acceleration	4	4
Enrichment	2	3
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	3	2
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	1	1

Senior High Program

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
Acceleration	3	3
Enrichment	4	4
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	1	2
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	2	1

It can be seen that the two groups differed on at least one choice at each level. At the elementary level, the difference was minor, with parents preferring enrichment and teachers and principals preferring emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration.

At the junior high level they were in agreement on their first choice of emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration. At the senior high level, the groups differed in preference for emphasis, with teachers preferring emphasis on acceleration, and teachers and principals preferring emphasis on enrichment.

A comparison of preferences for organization at the elementary level reveals the following:

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
Resource 1 day	1	1
Resource 1-2 hours	2	2
Self-contained	3	3
After school	4	4
Special school	5	5

As can be seen, the groups were in agreement on this item. They also agreed to a certain extent on the grade at which the gifted program should begin:

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
K	24%	13%
1	20%	11%
2	17%	15%
3-6	39%	55%
7-12	2%	7%

In general, however, the teachers and principals favor starting the program later than the parents.

Though not all groups were asked all of the Likert items, a comparison can still be made, however, for those items and for those areas for which similarities occurred. Items dealing with the following general areas were among the ten most positive for all three groups:

- Gifted students are able to keep up with assignments in the regular class.
- Gifted classes help children become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.
- The gifted program provides opportunities for children to develop new interests.
- Children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.

In addition, the following item was also among the ten most positive for both parents and teachers/principals:

- Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their full potential.

One item was among the five most negative for all three groups:

- Gifted children should complete any work missed while receiving gifted instruction.

The following item was among the five most negative for parents and teachers/principals:

- Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.

Considering the Likert items by major area: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities, and Program Benefits a great deal of similarity was found in the responses of the three groups. Under Program Considerations both parents and teachers/administrators viewed the need for the gifted program with the strongest agreement. These same groups ranked in order of agreement the following items: students should demonstrate mastery of the basic subjects prior to being allowed in the gifted program and the student should be responsible only for nonmastered concepts missed while receiving gifted instruction. The item receiving the most negative response for the two groups was directed toward whether the students should complete all work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.

Under Program Placement the overall mean for parents was 2.50, that of teachers/administrators 2.61, indicating relative agreement. There was some disagreement, however, with respect to given items. The reasonableness of the criteria for qualification in the gifted program was viewed more positively in a relative sense by parents than teachers/administrators, as was the speed of placement of the child in the program after identification. In both cases the parents were much more positive than the teacher/administrator group. The adequacy of explanation of the child's placement test results, however, showed a reverse trend with the teachers/administrators being more positive than the parents. Under Classroom Expectations the three groups had respective means of 2.23, 2.43, 2.00 for parents, teachers/administrators and students. Given that there was some difference in response overall, i.e., the students being most positive, the parents the next positive and teachers/administrators being the least positive, the agreement to specific items was relatively constant. The same can be said for the area of Communication on which the parents had a mean of 2.14 and the teachers/administrators a mean of 2.38. A similar finding was apparent for Facilities with the respective means being 2.91 and 2.82. In this case, however, the teachers/administrators viewed both the instructional facility and the transportation a little more positively than did parents.

For Program Benefits the means were respectively, 2.13, 2.38, and 2.00. The relative agreement among the three groups was somewhat consistent over items with the differences being the degree of positiveness. However, some items showed slight differences as in the case of the student's individual needs being met in the gifted program. The parents viewed it as a very positive 2.24; the teachers/administrators 2.60. In the case of whether or not the child is aware of the needs of others as a result of the gifted program the mean for the parents was 2.68, that of teachers/administrators 2.95. The largest difference as exhibited in the mean responses to the item concerning the student's performance in the regular class as a result of the gifted program with the parents viewing it with a mean of 2.53 and the teachers/administrators with a mean of 3.06.

Following are the percentages of each group that rated the gifted program as excellent or above average at each level:

	Parents	Teachers/Principals*	Students
Elementary Program	79%	67%	84%
Jr. High Program	56%	42%	--
Sr. High Program	31%	44%	--

*Based on those with knowledge of program.

Overall, the three groups rated the elementary program positively. The parent and teacher groups were both considerably less positive about the junior and senior high programs.

Junior High Program

Parents

In general, this group of parents was positive about the gifted program. Sixty-two percent rated the elementary program as above average or excellent, 59% rated the junior high program as above average or excellent, and 58% rated the senior high program as above average or excellent. They indicated a preference for emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration at the elementary and junior high levels. They also indicated a preference for a one to two hour per day pullout program both of these program types are currently in use in junior high. Fifty-eight percent believed the program should begin in grades K-2. There was a fair amount of consensus that early admission and grade skipping are not appropriate for gifted students. The other opportunities were considered appropriate by at least two-thirds of the respondents.

Considering the percentages of each group that rated the gifted program as excellent or above average, the following comparisons can be made for each level:

	Parents	Teachers/ Principals*	Students
Elementary	62%	49%	--
Junior High	59%	38%	64%
Senior High	58%	44%	--

*Based on those with knowledge of program.

Overall, the elementary program was rated most positively, and parents gave higher ratings at all three levels than did the teachers and principals.

On the 44 Likert items all mean responses were less than 3.00, indicating a positive response. Under Program Considerations the parents strongly agreed that there is a need for a gifted program. To a lesser degree they felt that the students should demonstrate grade level mastery in the basic subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program, and if a child is gifted in one or two areas they should receive services in those areas. The response to all other items under Program Considerations fell in the no opinion but positive area.

The overall mean response by parents to those items mapping to Program Placement received a mean of 2.63. The response to all items was positive with the highest responses concerning the reasonableness of the criterion for placement in the gifted program and whether or not the child was placed within 60 days of identification. The lowest mean, 2 94, was received by the item concerning the explanation the parents received concerning the child's placement test results. The area of Classroom Expectations received a more positive response with a mean of 2.48 falling into an agreed category. Again, all items received a positive response. The items that received the most positive responses or had the highest positive mean were directed toward the ability of the students to keep up with both the regular and gifted classes. Other areas which fall into an agreed category but which did not receive as positive a response were concerned with the adequacy of the grading procedure, 2.44; the qualifications of the teachers of the gifted, 2.49; and the preparation of elementary students for the junior high gifted program, 2.46. The item with the least positive response with a mean of 2.91 concerned whether or not the goals and objectives of the gifted program were clearly defined. Under the general area of Communication parents again responded with a positive mean in the agree category of 2.46. The parents were extremely positive concerning the availability of the teachers of the gifted for conferences and also agreed that there seems to be good cooperation between the teachers of the gifted class and the regular classroom teachers. The item which received the lowest mean response concerned the information they received on their child's progress in the gifted class. The general area viewed most negatively by parents was the area of Facilities. The parents viewed both the instructional facility and the transporation with positive means of 2.92 but just inside the positive range. Under the general area of Program Benefits the parents' mean score was 2.26 indicating a strong positive response. The items which received the highest positive mean responses were directed towards the child's enjoyment of the program, the parents' pleasure concerning the children's experiences, the enhancement of the child with respect to critical thinking, and the challenge experienced in the gifted classes. Two areas that were somewhat lower than the others but still positive were directed towards whether or not the gifted program helped the student become aware of the needs of others and whether positive changes had occurred in their child at home as a result of participation in the gifted classes. The parents were also less positive concerning the variety of subjects in the gifted class.

Teachers and Principals

Data from this group is not as positive as that from the previous groups; however, it is not negative either. The group indicated a preference for enrichment at the elementary level, emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration at the junior high level, and emphasis on acceleration with some enrichment in high school. These preferences generally conform to the existing program. In addition, they showed a preference for a one to two hour per day pullout program at the junior high level, which also conforms to the existing program. Forty-two percent believed the gifted program should begin in grades K-2.

It is difficult to make a general statement concerning the overall ratings of Mesa's gifted program. since the subgroups of teachers and principals differed on their ratings of the elementary and high school programs. Also, over half of the respondents indicated they had no knowledge of the elementary and high school programs. However, looking at the ratings of the combined subgroups, 49% rated the elementary program as excellent or above average, 38% rated the junior high program as excellent or above, and 44% rated the senior high programs as such.

Teachers/administrators responded positively to all but six items on the 38 item Likert scale. Under Program Considerations the teachers/administrators disagreed that the type of program for elementary, junior and senior high schools should be the same. They responded most positively to the need for a gifted program. They also felt that a student should demonstrate mastery in the basic subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program and that if a child is gifted in one or two areas, they should be served by the gifted program in those areas. Under the general area of Program Placement the teachers'/administrators' overall mean was 2.76, positive, but would fall under the operational definition in the no opinion area. In fact, all of the four items mapping to this area fell in the no opinion category and the positive side of the midpoint, 3.00. Under Classroom Expectations this group had an overall mean of 2.83, again in the no opinion category. They were most positive concerning agreement that the principal demonstrated support for the gifted program and the students were able to keep up both in the regular class and the gifted class. The item which received the lowest mean score under this area was in response to the sharing of the goals and objectives of the gifted program with the classroom teachers with a negative mean 3.54. Communication received a positive mean of 2.64 with the availability of the teachers for parent conferences receiving the highest response. The area of Facilities fell in a negative range with a mean of 3.06. Both instructional facilities and transportation were viewed negatively with respect to adequacy.

The area of Program Benefits received an overall mean of 2.63. again positive but in the no opinion range. One item was found in the no opinion range. One item was found in the negative end of the scale with a mean of 3.13. The item was directed toward whether or not the child becomes more aware of the needs of others as a result of the gifted program. Those items receiving the highest positive responses were directed toward the enhancement of students' communication of their ideas, improvement in problem solving and critical thinking, and the development in the students of new interests.

Students

Students' overall ratings of the junior high program were generally positive, with 64% rating it as above average or excellent. The most positive items dealt with various aspects of the program and benefits obtained from the program. The negative items dealt with treatment by students and teachers and other aspects of the gifted program.

On the 24 Likert items the students responded negatively to only three of the items. Under Program Considerations the students agreed that they were able to keep up assignments in the regular classroom. At the opposite end they did not feel that they were treated more favorably by students because they were in the program nor did they feel that they were treated more favorably by their regular classroom teacher because they were in the program. The students also disagreed with the item concerning the type of program being the same for elementary, junior and senior high school.

Under Classroom Expectations the overall mean response by students was a positive 2.41. The students were most positive toward the grading procedures used by the gifted teacher. They also indicated that they felt the elementary students in the gifted program were academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program. Under Program Benefits the mean was again a very positive 2.29. The responses to almost all the items fell into an agree category. The exceptions being the response to whether or not they spent more time reading since they have been in the gifted program and whether or not the gifted program has helped them become aware of the needs of others. They were extremely positive concerning the encouragement they received from their teacher to create original ideas or products, the opportunity to work independently in gifted classes, the enhancement of problem solving and critical thinking skills as well as the independent research skills learned in the class.

Comparison Across Groups

This section will include a brief summary of those items, from the junior high survey only, which were considered to be especially important and/or common to two or more groups. Comparing the parent and teacher/administrator groups on preference for type of program, the following results are obtained:

	Elementary	
	Parents	**Teachers/Principals**
Acceleration	**4**	**4**
Enrichment	**2**	**1**
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	**3**	**3**
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	**1**	**2**

Junior High

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
Acceleration	4	4
Enrichment	3	2
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	2	3
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	1	1

Senior High

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
Acceleration	3	2
Enrichment	4	4
Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	1	1
Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	2	3

It can be seen that the two groups differed on at least one choice at each level, although these differences were not great. For their first preferences, the groups differed only at the elementary level. Teachers and principals indicated a preference for enrichment, while parents preferred emphasis on enrichment with some acceleration.

Following is a comparison of preferences for the five possible organizations based on time and location in gifted classes:

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
Resource 1-2 hours	1	1
Resource 1 day	3	2
After school	4	4
Self-contained	2	3
Special school	5	5

Again, the two groups differed somewhat, although they agreed on their first preference of resource for 1-2 hours per day.

In general, parents believed the gifted program should begin at an earlier grade than did the teacher/administrator group:

	Parents	Teachers/Principals
K	30%	16%
1	16%	18%
2	12%	8%
3-6	37%	41%
7-12	5%	17%

Following are the two Likert items which were among the ten most positive for all three junior high groups:

- Gifted children are able to keep up with assignments in their regular classes.
- The gifted program helps children become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.

In addition, the following Likert items were among the ten most positive for the parent and teacher groups:

- Gifted children need services/programs beyond the regular curriculum to achieve their potential.
- Gifted children are able to keep up with assignments in the gifted program.
- A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.

The following items were among the ten most positive for parents and students:

- Children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.
- The gifted program helps children become aware of their capabilities.

There were no Likert items which were among the five most negative for all three groups. However, the following were among the five most negative for both teachers and parents:

- Transportaion provided for the gifted program is adequate.
- Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.

Considering the Likert items by major area: Program Considerations, Program Placement, Classroom Expectations, Communication, Facilities and Program Benefits, similarity was found between the parent and student responses with the teachers/administrators in general being quite a bit less positive than the other two groups. Under Program Considerations both parents and teachers/administrators viewed the need for the gifted program with the strongest agreement. These same groups ranked, in order of agreement, the following items: students should demonstrate mastery of the basic subjects prior to being allowed in the gifted program and a child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas. The item on which the two groups disagreed the most was directed toward whether or not the type of program should be the same for elementary, junior high, and senior high with the means for the parent group a positive 2.51 and the teachers/administrators a negative 3.05. On the majority of the items the parents were more positive than the teacher/administrator group. An exception is the item directed toward whether or not a child should complete all work that was missed while he or she was receiving gifted instruction. The parent group had a mean of 2.94. The teacher/administrator group had a mean of 2.69.

Under Program Placement the overall mean for parents was 2.63 that of teachers/administrators, 2.76, indicating relative agreement. There was disagreement, however, with respect to given items. The reasonableness of the criteria for qualification in the gifted program was viewed more positively, in a relative sense, by parents than teachers/administrators, 2.22 versus 2.64, as was the speed of placement of the child in the program after identification, 2.41 versus 2.78. In both cases the parents were much more positive than the teachers/administrators group. The adequacy of explanation of a child's placement test results, however, showed a reverse trend with the teachers/administrators being more positive, 2.71, than the parents, 2.94. Under Classroom Expectations the three groups had respective means of 2.48, 2.83 and 2.41 for parents, teachers/administrators and students. Given that there were different mean responses overall, i.e., the students being most positive, the parents the next, and teachers/administrators being the least positive, the agreement to specific items was relatively constant. One exception being whether or not elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program. Parents and students viewed this in the agreement category with positive responses of 2.46 and 2.49. The teachers/administrators were negative in their response to the item with a mean of 3.01. In the area of Communication the parent overall mean was 2.46, that of the teachers/administrators, 2.64. This relationship held with respect to the items concerning the availability of teachers for conferences and the cooperation between ELP teachers and classroom teachers as viewed by the two groups. But in the case of information given to parents concerning the child's progress the teachers/administrators viewed it more positively than the parents. The overall mean for Facilities for the parent group was 2.92 in the positive range although indicating no opinion. For the teachers/administrators it was in the negative range also in the no opinion range with a mean of 3.06.

For Program Benefits the means were respectively 2.26, 2.63 and 2.29 for parents, teachers/administrators and students. The relative agreement among the three groups was somewhat consistent over items with the differences being the degree of positiveness. Some items, however, showed slight differences as in the case of the students' individual needs being met in the program. The parents viewed it as a fairly positive 2.43, the teachers/administrators, 2.94. In the case of whether or not the child is aware of others as a result of the gifted program, the mean for the parents was 2.65, that of teachers/administrators a negative 3.13 and a student mean of 2.79. Another large difference was exhibited in the mean responses to the item concerning the student's performance in the regular class as a result of the gifted program with the parents viewing it with a mean of 2.42 and the teachers/administrators with a mean of 2.91.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Elementary Program

As perceived by parents, teachers/administrators and students, there is a strong need for services and/or programs beyond the regular classroom for gifted children. The program as offered by the Mesa Public Schools is above average to excellent. The method of implementing the program, i.e., a one full day per week pullout program emphasizing enrichment with some acceleration is the preferred method of implementation. The program as implemented delivers on its goals and objectives and/or expectations. That is, there are positive changes in the students participating in the program. The students become aware of their capabilities, they develop and/or maintain a positive perception of themselves, they improve their communication skills, and their problem solving and critical thinking skills are enhanced. The program accomplishes this through challenging and motivating the students in the gifted classroom, providing relevant enrichment activities, allowing the students to pursue in greater depth subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested, and offering a sufficient variety of subjects in the gifted classroom.

The three groups surveyed also viewed a number of the process variables in a very positive light. They felt that the goals and objectives of the ELP are clearly defined, that the grading procedures are adequate, and that the teachers are well-qualified to teach the gifted children. They felt that communication between teachers and parents is very good and that cooperation between the classroom teacher and the teacher of the gifted is more than adequate. These groups, however, do not view the program through rose-colored glasses. They don't feel that students perform better in the regular class as a result of the participation in the gifted class. Nor do they feel strongly that it has helped them become aware of the needs of others. They also feel that there are some problems with respect to instructional facilities and transportation. In a relative sense, they question the adequacy of the explanation of their children's placement test results and the testing services for placement in the gifted program.

In addition, parents and teachers/administrators felt that the elementary program should begin sooner than it does now. These groups also felt that some other adjustments should be made so that students could get credit for taking advanced courses while remaining in their current grade. That is, elementary students should receive credit for high school courses, and senior high students should receive credit for college courses. They also felt acceleration should be available by subject in any subject area as should independent studies. They did not, however, favor grade skipping.

The comments agreed in large part with the responses to the closed response items made by the three groups. The highest proportion of comments were positive comments about the program in general. However, there were some comments directed toward the improvement of communication between parents and teachers, the broadening of the scope of subjects offered and the need for a better transition between elementary and junior high. Viewing these comments with the total responses made by the groups indicates that they are not broadly held concerns, but they are concerns of a number of the parents, teachers/administrators, and/or students.

As the vast majority of responses made by all groups to all the surveys dealing with the elementary gifted program were positive and in support of the current program, it is strongly recommended that no significant changes in the program be made at this time. However, some minor changes can be addressed and some further investigations made. Facilities seems to be bothersome to a number of the respondents. The work required of the students when they return from the gifted classes is perceived also as a potential problem by parents and students. It is recommended that a policy be established concerning the specifics of the work the student is held responsible for or has to make up.

Also the feasibility should be determined, which would include investigations of cost, concerning the implementation of the gifted program at an earlier age and/or grade. The feasibility of credit for elementary students taking high school courses should also be determined.

Junior High Program

As perceived by parents, teachers/administrators, and students, there is a strong need for services and/or programs beyond the regular classroom for gifted students at the junior high level. The program, as offered by the Mesa Public Schools, is perceived to be above average to excellent. There is, however, a relatively high percentage of respondents, especially from the teacher/administrator group, that feel the program offered at the junior high is only average or below average to poor.

The method of implementing the program, i.e., a one to two hour per day pullout program emphasizing enrichment with some acceleration, is the preferred method of implementation. The program as implemented delivers its goals and objectives and/or expectations; that is, there are positive changes in the students participating in the program. The students become aware of their capabilities, they develop and/or maintain a positive perception of themselves, and they improve their communication skills. Their problem solving and critical thinking skills are enhanced. The program accomplishes these changes through challenging and motivating the students in the gifted classroom, providing relevant enrichment activities, allowing the students to pursue in greater depth subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested, and generally providing environment for children to develop new interests.

The teachers/administrators, although agreeing to the above statements were not quite as positive. They questioned the motivational factor of the program, the relevance of all activities, and whether or not the students' individual needs are being met in the classroom.

The three groups surveyed also viewed a number of the process variables in a positive light. They felt that the criteria the students have to meet to qualify for the program are reasonable, the grading procedures being used in the gifted classes are adequate, the teachers of the gifted students are qualified to teach in the program, and the teachers in the gifted classes are readily available for conferences.

These groups, however, were not entirely uncritical of the program. They did not feel that the gifted program has helped the students become aware of the needs of others. Nor did they feel that there are a sufficient variety of subjects in the gifted class. They also felt that there are problems with the general instructional facilities and transportation. These groups also questioned the adequacy of information received concerning the student's progress and whether or not adequate information on the criteria needed to qualify for the program has been shared; the same is true concerning the explanation of the student's placement test results. And they questioned whether or not the testing services for student placement in the gifted program are adequate. Although the junior high parents felt that their children were adequately prepared to enter the junior high gifted program, this item was questioned by the teacher/administrator respondents.

In addition, these groups felt that some adjustments should be made so that students could get credit for taking advanced courses while remaining in their current grade, that is, elementary students should receive credit for high school courses and senior high students should receive credit for college courses. They also felt acceleration should be available by subject in any subject area, as should independent studies. They did not, however, favor grade skipping.

The comments made by the respondents agreed in large part with the responses to the closed response items. There were, however, some areas which indicated some disagreement. It would appear that over all respondents a given area is viewed favorably, but there is still a high proportion of those responding that consider it a problem area, or at least a potential problem area. The highest proportion of comments were directed toward better communication between teachers and parents. The parents presented in their written comments a need for better teachers with the second highest proportion of their responses. Also high in the number of responses were general positive comments about the program. It also appears that there is some concern about the transition from the elementary to the junior high program. Compared to the total responses made by these groups, the comments are not broadly held concerns, but they are concerns of a number of parents, teachers/administrators, and/or students.

As the vast majority of responses made by all groups to all the surveys dealing with the junior high gifted program were positive and in support of the current program, it is strongly recommended that no significant changes in the program be made at this time. Some minor changes, however, can be addressed and some further investigations made. Facilities seem to be bothersome for a number of the respondents. Also, the work required of the students when they return from the gifted classes is perceived as a potential problem area. It is recommended that a policy be established concerning specifics of the work the students are to be held responsible for or have to make up. It would also appear that a review of the teachers in the program might be warranted. The junior high program has changed over the years and it could be that the exact placement of the teachers of the gifted is not the best placement for these teachers at this time. It would also appear that a review of the goals and objectives of the junior high program should be made and, if needed, a redefinition made. These goals should be publicized so that the different publics know the specifics of the program. This should also occur with respect to the specific criteria needed to enter the program and the resulting placement test results that the students receive.

Feasibility should also be investigated concerning the implementation of acceleration of courses within each subject area and the use of independent studies as well. The feasibility of credit for junior high students taking high school courses should also be determined.

APPENDIX A

Goals and Objectives of Gifted Program
Current ELP Distribution by Grade and School
Identification, Screening, and Placement Procedures

146

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM - ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAM

PHILOSOPHY

If we desire to educate each child to his or her fullest potential, then we must provide programs which will challenge our most capable students. Mesa Public School District's Extended Learning Program and Advanced Placement Program is committed to serving the special needs of intellectually gifted students with educational opportunities that are qualitatively different. This program is based on the belief that the special needs of these students require a curriculum which emphasizes critical thinking and creative problem solving.

GOALS

The Mesa Public School District seeks to identify and serve all qualified students through the Extended Learning Program and Advanced Placement Program. The purpose is to extend intellectual and creative abilities with an emphasis on self-direction. Thinking processes using advanced problem-solving skills and inquiry techniques will be stressed. Students will have opportunities to discuss and exchange ideas with intellectual peers and will be challenged to use their abilities in areas of interest to them.

OBJECTIVES

Students in the Extended Learning Program and Advanced Placement Program will:

1. Excel in academic attainment:
    a. through acquisition, organization, and evaluation of knowledge
    b. through perfecting skills of reading, writing, and use of numbers
    c. through creating original and worthwhile intellectual products
    d. through a commitment to life-long learning for its own sake
    e. through the care and feeding of one's intellectual curiosity

2. Become adept at such intellectual skills as:
    a. the definition of problems
    b. the analysis of problems
    c. the identification of alternative solutions to problems
    d. the application of appropriate research techniques and methodologies
    e. the recognition of when to pronounce and when to suspend intellectual judgment

3. Develop an appreciation of aesthetics and its relationship to the quality of life:
    a. through actual participation in the arts
    b. through the acquisition of background information of the kind that serves to enhance interest, understanding, and appreciation
    c. through creating products of beauty and/or utility
    d. through informed observation

4. Accept responsibility--moral, political, and economic--in relation to the total society and to other individuals:
    a. through developing leadership skills
    b. through becoming aware of and sensitive to the problems and needs of others
    c. through a continuing search for understanding of the problems--moral, political, economic, sociological, and environmental--of the body politic
    d. through the development of a commitment to ideas, individuals, and institutions
    e. through the constant exercise of analysis and evaluation and the constant application of flexibility
    f. through thorough investigation of career possibilities

5. Accept oneself as a worthy human being whose individual capacities, needs, and gifts are important in and of themselves.

6. Develop those moral and intellectual resources that allow one to work independently--in planning, executing, evaluation, and modifying.

GRADES 3-6

All students in grades 3 through 6 who qualify under district guidelines may be served in the Extended Learning Program operating in thirteen centers throughout the district. Students attend ELP one full day per week by grade level, and transportation is furnished by the district from the home school to the resource room.

Through creative, deductive, and inductive problem-solving approaches, students will engage in activities that enable them to learn independently and to develop useful organization structure. Stimulation of curiosity, knowledge, and creativity will take place with the use of curriculum units appropriate for the student's intellectual level. Examples of units are: oceanography, archaeology, energy, futurism, space, law, computer science, and Junior Great Books.

GRADES 7-9

Students who have qualified and/or participated in ELP in elementary school are eligible for referral to advanced programs in junior high schools. Interest and level of ability will largely determine areas students will pursue. Capable students are encouraged to investigate higher mathematics and science as well as the ELP offerings in English and social studies.

The purpose of ELP in the junior high schools is to provide a climate in which gifted students may use their talents for in-depth exploration and discovery. The program provides an intellectually stimulating and challenging atmosphere for the student with content and emphasis on the intellectual, emotional, and artistic dimensions of a person. Specifically, the content focuses on English and social studies with the following goals:

English:	to use logic responsibly to build an extensive vocabulary to refine and develop composition skills to appreciate advanced literature
Social Studies:	to compare American governmental structure to other governments to describe the role of the informed citizen in society to interpret current events to use methods and sources of research

GRADES 9-12

The Advanced Placement (AP) program is a cooperative educational endeavor of the College Entrance Examination Board. It is based on the fact that many young people can, with profit and delight, complete college-level studies in their secondary schools. It serves three groups: students who wish to pursue college-level studies while still in secondary school; schools that desire to offer these students the opportunity to do so; and colleges that wish to encourage and recognize such achievement. It does this by providing practical descriptions of college-level courses and the results of examinations given annually in May based on these courses to the colleges of the students' choice. Participating colleges, in turn, grant credit and appropriate placement, or one of these, to students who have done well on the examination.

Admission to AP is determined by student performance and recommendation of teachers. The following AP courses are offered in all Mesa high schools: English, calculus with analytical geometry, and American history. In addition, biology is offered at Mountain View and Westwood, and physics and chemistry at Mountain View, Mesa High, and Westwood.

CURRENT ELP DISTRIBUTION
BY GRADE AND REGULAR SCHOOL
1982-83

	Grade				
School	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Total**
Adams	1	-	1	1	3
Alma	4	10	8	10	32
Crimmon	11	8	2	9	30
Edison	6	15	12	5	38
Eisenhower	3	2	2	1	8
Emerson	7	10	6	8	31
Field	6	12	13	12	43
Hale	8	11	12	5	36
Hawthorne	8	10	6	8	31
Highland	4	8	5	5	22
Holmes	3	11	9	5	28
Irving	11	8	8	9	36
Jefferson	2	2	2	2	8
Jordan	6	8	9	5	28
Keller	8	3	2	9	22
Lehi	6	2	1	3	12
Lincoln	-	2	5	1	7
Lindbergh	4	5	2	4	15
Longfellow	1	1	-	1	3
Lowell	5	2	2	1	10
MacArthur	13	17	14	18	62
Pomeroy	3	4	5	4	16
Redbird	2	2	6	4	14
Roosevelt	7	7	6	6	26
Salk	3	8	2	3	15

ELP Distribution by Grade and School (continued)

	Grade				
School	3	4	5	6	Total
Stevenson	-	-	2	-	2
Taft	-	1	-	6	7
Washington	12	21	10	17	60
Webster	3	1	1	3	8
Whitman	3	1	2	10	16
Whittier	3	2	5	8	18
Total	153	193	160	186	692

ELP - Junior High - English and Social Studies
Grades 7-9 1982-83

Carson - 80*

Fremont - 50*

Kino - 100*

Mesa Jr. - 40

Poston - 50

Powell - 30

Rhodes - 75*

Taylor - 44

Duplicated count. Students may be enrolled in both ELP English and ELP Social Studies.

High School - AP
Grades 10-12 1982-83

Dobson - 20

Mesa High - 180*

Westwood - 75*

Mountain View - 105*

Duplicated count. Students may be enrolled in more than one Advanced Placement course.

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION-SCREENING-PLACEMENT

A. Procedures for Referral

A student may be nominated for the Extended Learning Program from any one of the following ways:

A parent; a classroom teacher; the principal; the school psychologist; the resource teacher; or by himself/herself, by requesting participation in the program.

In all cases, the nominations are made in writing to the Extended Learning Program resource teacher.

B. Procedures for Screening

1. Upon the initial nomination of a student to the Extended Learning Program, the ELP Referral Form and the Renzulli-Hartman Scale for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students will be completed by the referring classroom teacher or any other teacher or administrator making the referral.

   Group Otis-Lennon scores and district academic scores will be used as a basis for nomination; however, they may not be used in lieu of formal testing by the Extended Learning Program teacher. Available scores will be entered by the referring party.

2. Upon receipt by the ELP teacher of a written referral, a mini-staffing will be held by the ELP teacher, classroom teacher, and principal to determine if the student does, in fact, exhibit the characteristics which indicate that s/he can be considered as being a candidate for placement in the Extended Learning Program. This staffing does not necessarily have to be conducted formally and can be handled via phone, memo, etc. However, written documentation by the ELP teacher must be made on Step I.

3. Students recommended after the mini-staffing will be tested by the ELP teacher with an individual or small-group Otis-Lennon. Step II, Permission for Further ELP Screening, must be returned by the parent before testing.

4. Students will be eligible for placement in the Extended Learning Program based on the following criteria:

   a) 132 and above on individual/small-group Otis-Lennon
      OR
      130 and above on WISC-R or Stanford-Binet
      AND
      97th percentile in Reading Comprehension OR Math Concepts on California Achievement Test

OR

B) 128-131 ON INDIVIDUAL/SMALL-GROUP OTIS-LENNON
OR
127-129 ON WISC-R OR STANFORD-BINET

AND

97TH PERCENTILE IN READING COMPREHENSION AND MATH CONCEPTS ON CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST

ELIGIBLE STUDENTS WILL BE PLACED IN THE EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM, OR ON THE WAITING LIST IF SPACE IS LIMITED, UPON WRITTEN RECOMMENDATION OF THE ELP TEACHER, PRINCIPAL, AND ELP DIRECTOR. NO STUDENT WILL BE PLACED IN THE PROGRAM WITHOUT COMPLETION OF THE PLACEMENT CONFERENCE SECTION OF STEP I. PARENTS WILL BE NOTIFIED OF ELIGIBILITY VIA STEP III, OR OF NON-ELIGIBILITY VIA STEP IV.

5. STUDENTS WITH 132 AND ABOVE ON INDIVIDUAL/SMALL-GROUP OTIS-LENNON BUT NOT QUALIFYING ON ACHIEVEMENT SCORES WILL BE REFERRED FOR MINI-STAFFING (SEE B2) FOR POSSIBLE FURTHER EVALUATION BY PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES.

C. PROCEDURES FOR APPEAL

1. AN APPEAL FOR FURTHER SCREENING WITH A WISC-R FOR ANY STUDENT NOT MEETING THE ABOVE CRITERIA MAY BE REQUESTED IN WRITING, STATING REASONS, BY ANY MEMBER OF THE MINI-STAFFING COMMITTEE OR THE PARENT. APPEALS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM.

2. THE APPEAL PROCEDURE WILL INCLUDE COMPLETION OF PARENT REQUEST FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES, WHICH SHOULD BE RETURNED TO THE DIRECTOR OF THE EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM.

3. REFERRALS FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS WILL BE FORWARDED BY THE ELP DIRECTOR TO THE DIRECTOR OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES, TO BE TESTED WHEN PERSONNEL IS AVAILABLE.

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

REFERRAL FORM

Student ________________________________ Student No. __________

School ____________________ Grade ________ Date of Birth __________

	SCORE	DATE GIVEN
IQ TEST		
Otis-Lennon - Group	_____	__________
CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST		
Reading Comprehension	______%ile	__________
Math Concepts	______%ile	
OTHER		
____________________	______	__________

Reason for referral for further screening (be specific): __________
____
____
____
____
____
____

Referred by ______________________________
Title ______________________________
(classroom teacher, parent, etc.)
Date ______________________________

PLEASE COMPLETE RENZULLI-HARTMAN SCALE FOR RATING BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPERIOR STUDENTS, ATTACH TO THIS FORM, AND RETURN BOTH TO THE EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM TEACHER FROM YOUR SCHOOL

2/82

IDENTIFICATION SUGGESTIONS--PERFORMANCE DATA SCALES

The Renzulli-Hartman Scale for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students

Name ______________________________ Date ____________________

School ____________________ Grade ________ Age ____________________
Years Months

Teacher or person completing this form ______________________________

How long have you known this child? ______________________________ Months

Directions: These scales are designed to obtain teacher estimates of a student's characteristics in the areas of learning, motivation, creativity, and leadership. The items are derived from the research literature dealing with characteristics of gifted and creative persons. It should be pointed out that a considerable amount of individual differences can be found within this population and, therefore, the profiles are likely to vary a great deal. Each item in the scales should be considered separately and should reflect the degree to which you have observed the presence or absence of each characteristic. Since the four dimensions of the instrument represent relatively different sets of behavior, the scores obtained from the separate scales should not be summed to yield a total score. Please read the statements carefully and place an "X" in the appropriate place according to the following scale of values:

1 - If you have seldom or never observed this characteristic.
2 - If you have observed this characteristic occasionally.
3 - If you have observed this characteristic to a considerable degree.
4 - If you have observed this characteristic almost all of the time.

Space has been provided following each item for your comments.

Scoring: Separate scores for each of the three dimensions may be obtained as follows:

Add the total number of X's in each column to obtain the "Column Total."
Multiply the Column Total by the "Weight" for each column to obtain the "Weighted Column Total."
Sum the Weighted Column Totals across to obtain the "Score" for each dimension of the scale.
Enter the Scores below.

Learning Characteristics . . . . ______________

Motivational Characteristics . . . . ______________

Creativity Characteristics . . . . ______________

Leadership Characteristics . . . . ______________

PART I: LEARNING CHARACTERISTICS

	1	2	3	4
1. Has unusually advanced vocabulary for age or grade level; uses terms in a meaningful way; has verbal behavior characterized by "richness" of expression, elaboration and fluency.				
2. Possesses a large storehouse of information about a variety of topics (beyond the usual interests of youngsters his age).				
3. Has quick mastery and recall of factual information.				
4. Has rapid insight into cause-effect relationships; tries to discover the how and why of things; asks many provocative questions (as distinct from information or factual questions); wants to know what makes things (or people) "tick."				
5. Has a ready grasp of underlying principles and can quickly make valid generalizations about events, people or things; looks for similarities and differences in events, people and things.				
6. Is a keen and alert observer; usually "sees more" or "gets more" out of a story, film, etc., than others.				
7. Reads a great deal on his own; usually prefers adult-level books; does not avoid difficult material; may show a preference for biography, autobiography, encyclopedias and atlases.				
8. Tries to understand complicated material by separating it into its respective parts; reasons things out for himself; sees logical and commonsense answers.				
Column Total				
Weight	1	2	3	4
Weighted Column Total				
TOTAL				

PART II: MOTIVATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	1	2	3	4
1. Becomes absorbed and truly involved in certain topics or problems; is persistent in seeking task completion. (It is sometimes difficult to get him to move on to another topic.)				
2. Is easily bored with routine tasks.				
3. Needs little external motivation to follow through in work that initially excites him.				
4. Strives toward perfection; is self critical; is not easily satisfied with his own speed or products.				
5. Prefers to work independently; requires little direction from teachers.				
6. Is interested in many "adult" problems, such as religion, politics, sex, race -- more than usual for age level.				
7. Often is self assertive (sometimes even agressive); stubborn in his beliefs.				
8. Likes to organize and bring structure to things, people and situations.				
9. Is quite concerned with right and wrong, good and bad; often evaluates and passes judgment on events, people and things.				
Column Total				
Weight	1	2	3	4
Weighted Column Total				
TOTAL				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART III: CREATIVITY CHARACTERISTICS

	1	2	3	4
1. Displays a great deal of curiosity about many things; is constantly asking questions about anything and everything.				
2. Generates a large number of ideas or solutions to problems and questions; often offers unusual ("way out"), unique, clever responses.				
3. Is uninhibited in expressions of opinion; is sometimes radical and spirited in disagreement; is tenacious.				
4. Is a high risk taker; is adventurous and speculative.				
5. Displays a good deal of intellectual playfulness; fantasizes; imagines; manipulates ideas (i.e., changes, elaborates upon them); is often concerned with adapting, improving and modifying institutions, objects & systems				
6. Displays a keen sense of humor and sees humor in situations that may not appear to be humorous to others.				
7. Is unusually aware of his impulses and more open to the irrational in himself (freer expression of feminine interest for boys, greater than usual amount of independence for girls); shows emotional sensitivity.				
8. Is sensitive to beauty; attends to aesthetic characteristics of things.				
9. Is nonconforming; accepts disorder; is not interested in details; is individualistic; does not fear being different.				
10. Criticizes constructively; is unwilling to accept authoritarian pronouncements without critical examination.				
Column Total				
Weight	1	2	3	4
Weighted Column Total				
TOTAL				

PART IV: LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

	1	2	3	4
1. Carries responsibility well; can be counted on to do what he has promised and usually does it well.				
2. Is self confident with children his own age as well as adults; seems comfortable when asked to show his work to the class.				
3. Seems to be well liked by classmates.				
4. Is cooperative with teacher and classmates; tends to avoid bickering and is generally easy to get along with.				
5. Can express himself well; has good verbal facility and is usually well understood.				
6. Adapts readily to new situations; is flexible in thought and action and does not seem disturbed when the normal routine is changed.				
7. Seems to enjoy being around other people; is sociable and prefers not to be alone.				
8. Tends to dominate others when they are around; generally directs the activity in which he is involved.				
9. Participates in most social activities connected with the school; can be counted on to be there if anyone is.				
10. Excels in athletic activities; is well coordinated and enjoys all sorts of athletic games.				
Column Total				
Weight	1	2	3	4
Weighted Column Total				
TOTAL				

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

CONFERENCE RESULTS FOR EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

Student ______________________________ Student No. __________

School ____________________ Grade __________ Date of Birth __________

	DATE GIVEN	SCORE	QUALIFIES YES	QUALIFIES NO
1. IQ TEST				
Otis Lennon - Group	______	______	___	___
Otis Lennon - Individual	______	______	___	___
WISC-R	______	______	___	___
2. CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST				
Reading Comprehension	______	______	___	___
Math Concepts	______	______	___	___
3. RENZULLI-HARTMAN RATING SCALE				
Learning Characteristics	______	______		
Motivational Characteristics		______		
Creativity Characteristics		______		
Leadership Characteristics		______		
4. OTHER				
______________________	______	______	___	___

Comments: ____

____

____

____

PLACEMENT CONFERENCE

Date Held ____

By ____
ELP Director ELP Teacher Principal

Decision ____

____

____

STEP II

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

PERMISSION FOR FURTHER ELP SCREENING

TO: Parents and Students Interested in the Extended Learning Program

RE: Testing and Selection of Students for ELP

Student________________________________ Grade______________

School________________________________ Date______________

ELP Resource Teacher ________________________________

Students will be selected by a committee on the basis of highest ranking points on these items:

1) IQ test;
2) California Achievement Test;
3) Classroom teacher checklist (Renzulli-Hartman) on leadership, creativity, learning and motivational characteristics.

The objectives of the Extended Learning Program are:

1) To develop and use various problem-solving skills.
2) To develop and use extensive research skills.
3) To develop and use creative thinking skills.

Attendance in the Extended Learning Program is required as in any other class. Written evaluation records are maintained for each student placed in this program. Students who cannot give full attendance and performance are requested not to ask for review by the committee.

If you are interested and want your child to be reviewed by this required screening process, please sign and return this form.

Parent________________________________ Date______________

4/81

STEP III

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

SCREENING RESULTS FOR EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

Student ______________________________ Student No. ______________

School ____________________ Grade __________ Date of Birth ____________

After nomination for the Extended Learning Program at his/her school, each student is screened and evaluated. Data is reviewed by a committee to determine placement qualifications. These qualifications are based on IQ and achievement scores and teacher recommendation.

As a result of this screening:

☐ Your child is eligible for placement in the Extended Learning Program.

☐ Your child is eligible, but will be placed on a waiting list due to lack of space in the Extended Learning Program at this time.

☐ Your child is eligible for provisional placement in the Extended Learning Program.

Comments: ____

____

____

A conference to discuss the evaluation may be requested if desired. Contact Mrs. Eleanor TeSelle, Extended Learning Program Director, at 898-7878.

____
ELP Resource Teacher
School ________________________
Telephone ______________________
Date __________________________

IF YOU WISH YOUR CHILD TO BE PLACED IN THE EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM, OR ON THE WAITING LIST, PLEASE SIGN BELOW AND RETURN TO SCHOOL.

Parent Signature ______________________________ Date ______________

9/81

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

SCREENING RESULTS FOR EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM

Student ______________________________ Student No. ____________

School ______________________ Grade ________ Date of Birth ___________

After nomination for the Extended Learning Program at his/her school, each student is screened and evaluated. Data is reviewed by a committee to determine placement qualifications. These qualifications are based on IQ and achievement scores and teacher recommendation.

Based on the available data, your child is not eligible for placement in the Extended Learning Program.

A conference to discuss the evaluation may be requested if desired. Contact Mrs. Eleanor TeSelle, Extended Learning Program Director, at 898-7878.

If you desire your child to proceed to the appeal process, which involves individual screening administered by the school psychologist, contact Eleanor TeSelle for the required forms.

A screening review may be requested after a one-year period has elapsed.

____

ELP Resource Teacher

School ______________________

Telephone ____________________

Date _________________________

9/81

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM
PARENT/GUARDIAN REQUEST FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Name ______________________________ Birthdate ______________

School ______________ Grade ______________ Student No. ______________

Parents ______________ Address ______________

Phone ______________ City & Zip ______________

Date ______________

REASON FOR THIS REQUEST:
Screening to determine possible eligibility for Extended Learning Program.

____
Principal School Phone Teacher

I request that psychological personnel evaluate my child's progress in school and suggest possible alternatives and ways to best serve his/her educational needs. This evaluation will be done only with my written permission, and there is no cost to me.

I understand that the information from the evaluation is confidential and will be used only in the Mesa Public Schools by those working with my child. The data cannot be released to other schools or professionals outside the Mesa Public Schools without my written permission.

Mesa Public Schools has my permission to conduct a psychological and educational evaluation of my child. The results of this evaluation may be shared with me at my request. In signing this form, I acknowledge that I have been informed of my due process rights.

State law requires communication in my primary language. The primary language used in my home is:

☐ English ☐ Spanish ☐ Other ______________

The primary language of the child is:

☐ English ☐ Spanish ☐ Other ______________

Signature of Mother ______________________ Date ______________

Signature of Father ______________________ Date ______________

Signature of Guardian ______________________ Date ______________

Please return completed form to: Eleanor TeSelle, Mesa Public Schools,
14 West Second Avenue, Mesa, AZ 85202

5/79

APPENDIX B

Surveys of Gifted Program

STUDENT SURVEY FOR ELEMENTARY EXTENDED LEARNING PROGRAM (ELP)

Please respond to the following statements based upon your experience in the Mesa Public Schools Elementary Gifted Program (Extended Learning Program). Fill in your responses on the answer sheet.

1. Are you currently enrolled in the gifted program? A) Yes B) No

2. How many years (including this year) have you been enrolled in a Mesa Gifted Program?

A) 1 B) 2 C) 3 D) 4 E) 5 or more

3. How would you rate your elementary gifted program?

A) Excellent B) Above Average C) Average D) Below Average E) Poor

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. The activities in my ELP class are challenging to me.	A	B	C	D	E
5. The ELP program has helped me become better in problem solving and critical thinking.	A	B	C	D	E
6. I have learned independent research skills in my ELP classes.	A	B	C	D	E
7. The ELP program has taught me skills which allow me to see both sides of an issue.	A	B	C	D	E
8. I use what I have learned in my ELP class in everyday situations.	A	B	C	D	E
9. Being in an ELP class has given me greater self-confidence.	A	B	C	D	E
10. I enjoy school more when I am in the ELP program.	A	B	C	D	E
11. I am treated better by other students because I am in the ELP program.	A	B	C	D	E
12. I am treated better by my regular classroom teachers because I am in the ELP program.	A	B	C	D	E
13. I wish I could spend more time in the ELP class.	A	B	C	D	E
14. My teacher in the ELP class encourages me to create original ideas or products.	A	B	C	D	E
15. I have adequate opportunities to work independently in my ELP class.	A	B	C	D	E
16. I think my ELP teacher is fair when she/he evaluates my work.	A	B	C	D	E

BEST COPY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided, Don't Kno	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17. I have been introduced to many different subjects in my ELP class.	A	B	C	D	E
18. There are too many students in the ELP classes for good instruction.	A	B	C	D	E
19. My regular classroom teachers expect me to complete work that I already understand when I return from my ELP class.	A	B	C	D	E
20. I feel that I should be responsible for all work missed in my regular classes when I am in my ELP class.	A	B	C	D	E
21. I feel that I should not be responsible for work missed in my regular class that I already understand.	A	B	C	D	E
22. I am able to keep up with assignments in my regular class.	A	B	C	D	E
23. The ELP program has allowed me to learn about the subjects in which I am particularly interested.	A	B	C	D	E
24. I have developed new interests as a result of being in the ELP program.	A	B	C	D	E
25. The ELP program has helped me become aware of my capabilities.	A	B	C	D	E
26. The ELP program has helped me become aware of the needs of others.	A	B	C	D	E
27. The ELP program has helped me learn to communicate my ideas to other people.	A	B	C	D	E
28. I spend more time reading since I have been in the ELP program.	A	B	C	D	E

For questions 29-30, please mark your responses on the survey.

29. What do you like most about your ELP class?

30. If you could change something about your ELP class, what would it be?

166

BEST COPY

BEST COPY

STUDENT SURVEY FOR JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

Please respond to the following statements based upon your experience in the Mesa Public Schools Junior High Gifted Program (Extended Learning Program). Fill in your responses on the answer sheet.

1. Are you currently enrolled in the gifted program? A) Yes B) No

2. How many years (including this year) have you been enrolled in a Mesa Gifted Program?

   A) 1 B) 2 C) 3 D) 4 E) 5 or more

3. How would you rate your junior high gifted program?

   A) Excellent B) Above Average C) Average D) Below Average E) Poor

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4.	The activities in my gifted class are challenging to me.	A	B	C	D	E
5.	The gifted program has helped me become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	A	B	C	D	E
6.	I have learned independent research skills in my gifted class.	A	B	C	D	E
7.	The gifted program has taught me skills which allow me to analyze both sides of an issue.	A	B	C	D	E
8.	I have learned how to apply knowledge to practical situations in my gifted class.	A	B	C	D	E
9.	Being in a gifted class has given me greater self-confidence.	A	B	C	D	E
10.	I enjoy school more when I am in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
11.	I am treated more favorably by other students because I am in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
12.	I wish I could spend more time in the gifted class.	A	B	C	D	E
13.	I am treated more favorably by my regular classroom teachers because I am in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
14.	My teacher in the gifted class encourages me to create original ideas or products.	A	B	C	D	E
15.	I have adequate opportunities to work independently in my gifted class.	A	B	C	D	E
16.	The grading procedures used by my gifted classroom teacher are fair.	A	B	C	D	E
17.	I have been exposed to a wide variety of subjects in my gifted class.	A	B	C	D	E

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. There are too many students in the gifted classes for adequate instruction.	A	B	C	D	E
19. I am able to keep up with assignments in my regular classes.	A	B	C	D	E
20. The gifted program has allowed me to pursue the subjects in which I am particularly interested.	A	B	C	D	E
21. I have developed new interests as a result of being in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
22. The gifted program has helped me become aware of my capabilities.	A	B	C	D	E
23. The gifted program has helped me become aware of the needs of others.	A	B	C	D	E
24. The gifted program has helped me learn to communicate my ideas to other people.	A	B	C	D	E
25. I spend more time reading since I have been in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
26. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
27. The type of program for elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same.	A	B	C	D	E

For questions 28-29, please mark your responses on the survey.

28. What do you like most about your gifted class?

29. If you could change something about your gifted class, what would it be?

BEST COPY

BEST COPY

PARENT SURVEY FOR ELEMENTARY GIFTED PROGRAM

We are surveying the parents of students who are currently or have been in the Mesa Public Schools Elementary Gifted Program. Please complete this survey instrument for the child whose name is on the front of the survey envelope. Please base your responses on your child's experiences in the elementary gifted program.

1. Name of your child's current regular school:____________________

2. Name of school where your child attends (attended) the elementary gifted program:____________________

3. Child's sex: Male_____ Female_____

4. Child's current grade:_____

5. Check all grades in which your child has participated in a gifted program. Check current grade if applicable.

Grade 3_____	Grade 7_____	Grade 10_____
4_____	8_____	11_____
5_____	9_____	12_____
6_____		

6. If your child once participated in a gifted program but does so no longer, please check all of the reasons for withdrawal that apply:

Difficulties in the gifted program _____
Graduated out of the program _____
Did not benefit from gifted involvement _____
Teacher pressure in regular classes _____
Unable to "keep up" with assignments in regular classes _____
Missing out on too many activities in regular classes _____
Other (please specify): _____
____

7. I first learned about Mesa's Gifted Program from: Check one.

1) Teacher_____
2) School _____
3) Parent _____
4) Other _____

FOR CODER USE ONLY:
(Make no marks in
this area.)

Col. 1
/___/
Survey Code

Col. 2-4
/___/___/___/
Id.

1. Col. 5-6
/___/___/
School Code

2. Col. 7-8
/___/___/
School Code

3. Col. 9
/___/
Sex: M,F

4. Col. 10-11
/___/___/
Grade

5. Col. 12-15
/___/___/___/___/

Col. 16-18
/___/___/___/

Col. 19-21
/___/___/___/
Grade: 1 = Yes
0 = No
Per Column

6. Col. 22-28
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
Reason: 1 = Yes
0 = No
Per Column

7. Col. 29
/___/
Source: 1,2,3,4

R & E 10/82

BEST COPY

8. I have visited my child's gifted class _____ times.

8. Col. 30-32
/ / / /
# cf visits

9. Did it increase your understanding of the program?

1) Yes_____ 2) No_____ 3) Undecided_____

9. Col. 33
/ /
Underst: 1,2,3

10. How would you rate the gifted program in Mesa as it exists now? Check one for each column:

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High
1) Excellent	_____	_____	_____
2) Above Average	_____	_____	_____
3) Average	_____	_____	_____
4) Below Average	_____	_____	_____
5) Poor	_____	_____	_____

10. Col. 34-36
/ / / /
Rating: 1,2,3,4
5
Per Column

11. From which of the following sources do you receive most of your information about gifted children? Check one:

1) Magazines and newsletters _____
2) Parent/teacher conferences_____
3) School personnel _____
4) Workshops about gifted _____

11. Col. 37
/ /
Info: 1,2,3,4

12. Check which group you have contacted most frequently about Mesa's Gifted Program.

1) School administration _____
2) Regular classroom teacher_____
3) Teacher of gifted classes_____
4) School board _____
5) Mesa Parents Association
of Gifted and Talented _____

12. Col. 38
/ /
Contact: 1,2,3,
4,5

13. Rate your present degree of involvement with the gifted program in Mesa. Check one:

1) A great deal _____
2) Moderately _____
3) Not very much_____

13. Col. 39
/ /
Involve: 1,2,3

DIRECTIONS: Please read each statement carefully. There are no right or wrong answers. Just circle the number which best describes how you feel about each statement based upon your knowledge about the Mesa Schools Gifted Program.

Col. 40-82

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
14. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided, Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. I received adequate information on the criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The goals and objectives of the Mesa Gifted Programs are clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5
18. My child was placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I received an adequate explanation of my child's placement test results.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I am satisfied with the procedure of providing gifted instruction to my child on a part-time basis.	1	2	3	4	5
22. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
25. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
26. The amount of time per week that my child spends in gifted classes is sufficient.	1	2	3	4	5
27. My child is exposed to a sufficient variety of subjects in gifted classes.	1	2	3	4	5
28. The gifted program adequately motivates my child.	1	2	3	4	5
29. The teachers of classes for gifted children are qualified to teach gifted children.	1	2	3	4	5
30. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available if I request a conference.	1	2	3	4	5
31. There are too many students in my child's gifted class for adequate instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep me adequately informed of my child's progress.	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
33.	Cooperation between my child's gifted class teacher and regular class teachers seems to be good.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Regular class teachers expect my child to complete work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
35.	I feel that my child should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
36.	I feel that my child should complete any work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
37.	My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in his/her regular class.	1	2	3	4	5
38.	My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
39.	My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
40.	I have been pleased with my child's experiences in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
41.	My child's individual needs are being met in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
42.	I can see positive changes in my child at home as a result of participation in gifted classes.	1	2	3	4	5
43.	The gifted program has helped my child become aware of his/her capabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	The gifted program has helped my child develop and/or maintain a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	The gifted program has helped my child become aware of the needs of others.	1	2	3	4	5
46.	The gifted program has helped my child communicate his/her ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
47.	The gifted classes have helped my child become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	1	2	3	4	5
48.	The gifted program has provided opportunities for my child to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which he/she is particularly skilled and/or interested.	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49. The gifted program has provided the opportunities for my child to develop new interests.	1	2	3	4	5
50. My child is intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
51. My child performs better in his/her regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
52. In the regular class my child has been allowed to progress through concepts as he/she exhibits mastery.	1	2	3	4	5
53. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
54. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	1	2	3	4	5
55. The enrichment activities provided my child in gifted classes are relevant.	1	2	3	4	5
56. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5

Please respond to the following statements regarding what the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program should be if it were changed. There are several types of programs for gifted education. Two of the main categories are acceleration and enrichment. Acceleration increases instructional pace or school grade progress for high ability students. This includes early admission, grade skipping, advanced placement, and speeded-up presentation of content material. Enrichment provides supplementary activities and instruction for gifted students including general exploratory activites, group training activities, and individual and small group investigations of real problems. The expansion and modification of the curriculum is intended to make the material presented more challenging.

57. Keeping in mind the above definitions, please rank the program types you prefer within each level. (elementary, junior high, senior high) from 1 to 4. Use 1 as the highest preference.

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High
1) Acceleration	___	___	___
2) Enrichment	___	___	___
3) Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	___	___	___
4) Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	___	___	___

FOR CODER USE ONLY:

57. Col. 83-86
/ / / / /
Elementary

Col. 87-90
/ / / / /
Junior High

Col. 91-94
/ / / / /
Senior High

Type: 1,2,3,4
Per column

58. At what grade level (K-12) should the Mesa Gifted Program begin?_____

58. Col. 95-96
/ /
Grade

59. Please check the type of opportunities which you feel are appropriate for gifted children. Check as many as apply:

1) Early admission to: Kindergarten_____
Junior High_____
High School_____
College_____

2) Grade skipping_____

3) Advanced placement_____

4) Out of grade-level classes_____

5) Acceleration by subject in any subject area_____

6) High school credit for college classes_____

7) High school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes_____

8) Independent studies_____

9) Small group studies_____

10) Field trips_____

59. Col. 97-109
Opp: 1 = Yes
0 = No

60. Listed below are five possible organizations based upon the location and time spent in a gifted program. Please rank these from 1 to 5 in order of preference with 1 being the highest preference.

Rank

_____Resource program - 1 to 2 hr. per day pull-out program.

_____Resource program - 1 full day per week pull-out program.

_____After school program - 1-3 hr. per week after school hours.

_____Self-contained - 5 full days per week with teacher of the gifted.

_____5 full days per week in a special school.

60. Col. 110-114
Org: 1,2,3,4,5
Per column

61. What would you like to see done next year to further enhance your child's program?

62. Please make any additional suggestions you have for the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program.

63. If your child has been in the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program at more than one level (elementary, junior high, high school), please comment upon the strengths and weaknesses of the program in preparing students for successful transition between these levels.

BEST COPY

BEST COPY

PARENT SURVEY FOR JUNIOR HIGH GIFTED PROGRAM

We are surveying the parents of students who are currently or have been in the Mesa Public Schools Junior High Gifted Program. Please complete this survey instrument for the child whose name is on the front of the survey envelope. Please base your responses on your child's experiences in the junior high gifted program.

1. Name of your child's current regular school:____________________

2. Name of school where your child attends (attended) the junior high gifted program:____________________

3. Child's sex: Male_____ Female_____

4. Child's current grade:_____

5. Check all grades in which your child has participated in a gifted program. Check current grade if applicable.

Grade 3_____
4_____
5_____
6_____

Grade 7_____
8_____
9_____

Grade 10_____
11_____
12_____

6. If your child once participated in a gifted program but does so no longer, please check all of the reasons for withdrawal that apply:

Difficulties in the gifted program _____
Graduated out of the program _____
Did not benefit from gifted involvement _____
Teacher pressure in regular classes _____
Unable to "keep up" with assignments in regular classes _____
Missing out on too many activities in regular classes _____
Other (please specify): _____
____

7. I first learned about Mesa's Gifted Program from: Check one.

1) Teacher_____
2) School_____
3) Parent_____
4) Other_____

FOR CODER USE ONLY:
(Make no marks in
this area.)

Col. 1
/__/
Survey Code

Col. 2-4
/__/__/__/
Id.

1. Col. 5-6
/__/__/
School Code

2. Col.7-8
/__/__/
School Code

3. Col. 9
/__/
Sex: M,F

4. Col. 10-11
/__/__/
Grade

5. Col. 12-15
/__/__/__/__/

Col. 16-18
/__/__/__/

Col. 19-21
/__/__/__/
Grade: 1 = Yes
0 = No
Per Column

6. Col. 22-28
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
Reason: 1 = Yes
0 = No
Per Column

7. Col. 29
/__/
Source: 1,2,3,4

R & E 10/82

8. I have visited my child's gifted class _____ times.

8. Col. 30-32
/ / / /
# of visits

9. Did it increase your understanding of the program?

1) Yes_____ 2) No_____ 3) Undecided_____

9. Col. 33
/ /
Underst: 1,2,3

10. How would you rate the gifted program in Mesa as it exists now? Check one for each column:

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High
1) Excellent	_____	_____	_____
2) Above Average	_____	_____	_____
3) Average	_____	_____	_____
4) Below Average	_____	_____	_____
5) Poor	_____	_____	_____

10. Col. 34-36
/ / / /
Rating: 1,2,3,4
5
Per Column

11. From which of the following sources do you receive most of your information about gifted children? Check one:

1) Magazines and newsletters _____
2) Parent/teacher conferences_____
3) School personnel _____
4) Workshops about gifted _____

11. Col. 37
/ /
Info: 1,2,3,4

12. Check which group you have contacted most frequently about Mesa's Gifted Program.

1) School administration _____
2) Regular classroom teacher_____
3) Teacher of gifted classes_____
4) School board _____
5) Mesa Parents Association of Gifted and Talented _____

12. Col. 38
/ /
Contact: 1,2,3,
4,5

13. Rate your present degree of involvement with the gifted program in Mesa. Check one:

1) A great deal _____
2) Moderately _____
3) Not very much_____

13. Col. 39
/ /
Involve: 1,2,3

DIRECTIONS: Please read each statement carefully. There are no right or wrong answers. Just circle the number which best describes how you feel about each statement based upon your knowledge about the Mesa Schools Gifted Program.

Col. 40-82

14. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided, Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. I received adequate information on the criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The goals and objectives of the Mesa Gifted Programs are clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5
18. My child was placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I received an adequate explanation of my child's placement test results.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I am satisfied with the procedure of providing gifted instruction to my child on a part-time basis.	1	2	3	4	5
22. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
25. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	1	2	3	4	5
26. The amount of time per week that my child spends in gifted classes is sufficient.	1	2	3	4	5
27. My child is exposed to a sufficient variety of subjects in gifted classes.	1	2	3	4	5
28. The gifted program adequately motivates my child.	1	2	3	4	5
29. The teachers of classes for gifted children are qualified to teach gifted children.	1	2	3	4	5
30. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available if I request a conference.	1	2	3	4	5
31. There are too many students in my child's gifted class for adequate instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep me adequately informed of my child's progress.	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY

BEST COPY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
33. Cooperation between my child's gifted class teacher and regular class teachers seems to be good.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Regular class teachers expect my child to complete work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I feel that my child should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I feel that my child should complete any work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
37. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in his/her regular class.	1	2	3	4	5
38. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
39. My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I have been pleased with my child's experiences in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
41. My child's individual needs are being met in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I can see positive changes in my child at home as a result of participation in gifted classes.	1	2	3	4	5
43. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of his/her capabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
44. The gifted program has helped my child develop and/or maintain a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	1	2	3	4	5
45. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of the needs of others.	1	2	3	4	5
46. The gifted program has helped my child communicate his/her ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
47. The gifted classes have helped my child become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	1	2	3	4	5
48. The gifted program has provided opportunities for my child to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which he/she is particularly skilled and/or interested.	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49. The gifted program has provided the opportunities for my child to develop new interests.	1	2	3	4	5
50. My child is intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
51. My child performs better in his/her regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
52. In the regular class my child has been allowed to progress through concepts as he/she exhibits mastery.	1	2	3	4	5
53. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5
54. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	1	2	3	4	5
55. The enrichment activities provided my child in gifted classes are relevant.	1	2	3	4	5
56. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	1	2	3	4	5

Please respond to the following statements regarding what the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program should be if it were changed. There are several types of programs for gifted education. Two of the main categories are acceleration and enrichment. Acceleration increases instructional pace or school grade progress for high ability students. This includes early admission, grade skipping, advanced placement, and speeded-up presentation of content material. Enrichment provides supplementary activities and instruction for gifted students including general exploratory activites, group training activities, and individual and small group investigations of real problems. The expansion and modification of the curriculum is intended to make the material presented more challenging.

57. Keeping in mind the above definitions, please rank the program types you prefer within each level. (elementary, junior high, senior high) from 1 to 4. Use 1 as the highest preference.

	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High
1) Acceleration	____	____	____
2) Enrichment	____	____	____
3) Emphasis on Acceleration with some Enrichment	____	____	____
4) Emphasis on Enrichment with some Acceleration	____	____	____

FOR CODER USE ONLY:

57. Col. 83-86
/ / / / /
Elementary

Col. 87-90
/ / / / /
Junior High

Col. 91-94
/ / / / /
Senior High

Type: 1,2,3,4
Per column

BEST COPY

58. At what grade level (K-12) should the Mesa Gifted Program begin?_____

58. Col. 95-96
☐☐
Grade

59. Please check the type of opportunities which you feel are appropriate for gifted children. Check as many as apply:

1) Early admission to: Kindergarten_____
Junior High _____
High School _____
College _____

2) Grade skipping _____

3) Advanced placement _____

4) Out of grade-level classes _____

5) Acceleration by subject in any subject area _____

6) High school credit for college classes _____

7) High school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes _____

8) Independent studies _____

9) Small group studies _____

10) Field trips _____

59. Col. 97-109
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
Opp: 1 = Yes
0 = No

60. Listed below are five possible organizations based upon the location and time spent in a gifted program. Please rank these from 1 to 5 in order of preference with 1 being the highest preference.

Rank

_____Resource program - 1 to 2 hr. per day pull-out program.

_____Resource program - 1 full day per week pull-out program.

_____After school program - 1-3 hr. per week after school hours.

_____Self-contained - 5 full days per week with teacher of the gifted.

_____5 full days per week in a special school.

60. Col. 110-114
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
Org: 1,2,3,4,5
Per column

61. What would you like to see done next year to further enhance your child's program?

62. Please make any additional suggestions you have for the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program.

63. If your child has been in the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program at more than one level (elementary, junior high, high school), please comment upon the strengths and weaknesses of the program in preparing students for successful transition between these levels.

BEST COPY

BEST COPY

TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY OF THE GIFTED PROGRAM

Please respond to the following questions based upon your experience with the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program. Fill in your responses on the answer sheet.

1. At what grade level should the Mesa Gifted Program begin? (Select one.)

A. Kindergarten
C. Grade 2
E. Grades 7-12
B. Grade 1
D. Grades 3-6

2. How would you rate the elementary gifted program in Mesa as it exists now?

A. Excellent
B. Above Average
C. Average
D. Below Average
E. No Knowledge of Program

3. How would you rate the junior high gifted program in Mesa as it exists now?

A. Excellent
B. Above Average
C. Average
D. Below Average
E. No Knowledge of Program

4. How would you rate the high school gifted program in Mesa as it exists now?

A. Excellent
B. Above Average
C. Average
D. Below Average
E. No Knowledge of Program

Please respond to the following statements regarding what the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program should be if it were changed. There are several types of programs for gifted education. Two of the main categories are acceleration and enrichment. Acceleration increases instructional pace or school grade progress for high ability students. This includes early admission, grade skipping, advanced placement, and speeded-up presentation of content material. Enrichment provides supplementary activities and instruction for gifted students including general exploratory activities, group training activities, and individual and small group investigations of real problems. The expansion and modification of the curriculum is intended to make the material presented more challenging.

Keeping in mind the above definitions, please answer the next three questions.

5. Which type of gifted program would you prefer for elementary?

A. Acceleration
B. Enrichment
C. Emphasis on Acceleration
with some Enrichment
D. Emphasis on Enrichment
with some Acceleration

6. Which type of gifted program would you prefer for junior high?

   A. Acceleration
   B. Enrichment
   C. Emphasis on Acceleration
      with some Enrichment
   D. Emphasis on Enrichment
      with some Acceleration

7. Which type of gifted program would you prefer for senior high?

   A. Acceleration
   B. Enrichment
   C. Emphasis on Acceleration
      with some Enrichment
   D. Emphasis on Enrichment
      with some Acceleration

Listed below are five possible organizations based upon the location and time spent in a gifted program. Please rank these in order of preference. Mark A as being the highest preference, B as next, and so on. Note: Questions 8-12 will have one A, one B, one C, one D, and one E.

Rank

8. _____Resource program - 1 to 2 hr. per day pull-out program.
9. _____Resource program - 1 full day per week pull-out program.
10. _____After school program - 1-3 hr. per week after school hours.
11. _____Self-contained - 5 full days per week with teacher of the gifted.
12. _____5 full days per week in a special school.

Please rank the reasons for student withdrawal from the program using A as the most frequent, B as the next, etc. through E. Note: Questions 13-17 will have one A, one B, one C, one D, and one E.

Rank

13. _____Moved out of area.
14. _____Academic difficulties in gifted class.
15. _____Academic difficulties in regular class.
16. _____Behavior problems in gifted class.
17. _____Behavior problems in regular class.

BEST COPY

DIRECTIONS: Please read each statement carefully. There are no right or wrong answers. Select the response that describes how you feel about each statement based upon your involvement in the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program. Fill in your responses on the answer sheet.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	A	B	C	D	E
19. The district goals and objectives for the Mesa Gifted Program have been shared with classroom teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
20. The criteria gifted children have to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	A	B	C	D	E
21. Gifted children are placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	A	B	C	D	E
22. Parents are provided an adequate explanation of their child's test results for gifted placement.	A	B	C	D	E
23. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	A	B	C	D	E
24. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment, or a combination of acceleration and enrichment.	A	B	C	D	E
25. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	A	B	C	D	E
26. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	A	B	C	D	E
27. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	A	B	C	D	E
28. The amount of time per week that gifted children spend in gifted classes is sufficient.	A	B	C	D	E
29. Gifted children are exposed to a sufficient variety of subjects in gifted classes.	A	B	C	D	E
30. The gifted program adequately motivates gifted children.	A	B	C	D	E
31. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available for parent conferences.	A	B	C	D	E
32. There are too many students in the gifted class for adequate instruction.	A	B	C	D	E

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
33. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep parents adequately informed of their child's progress.	A	B	C	D	E
34. Cooperation between regular classroom teachers and the teacher of the gifted is good.	A	B	C	D	E
35. Principal demonstrate support for the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
36. I feel that gifted children should complete any work that was missed while receiving gifted instruction.	A	B	C	D	E
37. I feel that gifted children should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while receiving gifted instruction.	A	B	C	D	E
38. -Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the regular class.	A	B	C	D	E
39. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
40. The individual needs of gifted children are being met in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
41. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of their capabilities.	A	B	C	D	E
42. The gifted program helps the gifted child develop and/or maintain a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	A	B	C	D	E
43. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of the needs of others.	A	B	C	D	E
44. The gifted program helps gifted children communicate their ideas.	A	B	C	D	E
45. The gifted program helps gifted children become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	A	B	C	D	E
46. The gifted program has provided opportunities for gifted children to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested.	A	B	C	D	E
47. The gifted program provides opportunities for gifted children to develop new interests.	A	B	C	D	E
48. Gifted children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	A	B	C	D	E

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided/ Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49. Gifted children perform better in the regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
50. In the regular class gifted children are allowed to progress through concepts as mastery is exhibited.	A	B	C	D	E
51. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E
52. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	A	B	C	D	E
53. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in gifted classes are relevant.	A	B	C	D	E
54. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in regular classes are relevant.	A	B	C	D	E
55. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	A	B	C	D	E

For questions 56-58, please mark your responses on the survey.

56. Please check the type of opportunities which you feel are appropriate for gifted children. Check as many as apply:

1) Early admission to: Kindergarten_____
Junior High _____
High School _____
College _____
2) Grade skipping _____
3) Advanced placement _____
4) Out of grade-level classes _____
5) Acceleration by subject in any subject area _____
6) High school credit for college classes _____
7) High school credit for K-8 students taking high school classes
8) Independent studies _____
9) Small group studies _____
10) Field trips _____

57. What would you like to see done next year to further enhance the gifted program?

58. Please make any additional suggestions you have for the Mesa Public Schools Gifted Program.

APPENDIX C

Mean Responses to Likert Items

Mean Responses to Likert Items on Student Survey of Elementary Gifted Program

Item	Means**		
	Elem. Student	Junior High Student	Overall
PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS			
11. I am treated better by other students because I am in the ELP program.	3.45	3.62	3.51
12. I am treated better by my regular classroom teachers because I am in the ELP program.	3.30	3.24	3.28
13. I wish I could spend more time in the ELP class.	1.85	2.66	2.14*
19. My regular classroom teachers expect me to complete work that I already understand when I return from my ELP class.	3.08	2.52	2.88*
20. I feel that I should be responsible for all work missed in my regular classes when I am in my ELP class.	3.80	3.46	3.68
21. I feel that I should not be responsible for work missed in my regular class that I already understand.	2.38	2.61	2.47
22. I am able to keep up with assignments in my regular class.	1.92	1.93	1.93
CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS	Area Mean:		2.00
16. I think my ELP teacher is fair when she/he evaluates my work.	1.62	1.85	1.70
18. There are too many students in the ELP classes for good instruction.	3.87	3.44	3.71*

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of elementary and junior high students for elementary program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Item	Means** Elem. Student	 Junior High Student	 Overall
PROGRAM BENEFITS	Area Mean:		2.00
4. The activities in my ELP class are challenging to me.	1.85	2.02	1.91
5. The ELP program has helped me become better in problem solving and critical thinking.	1.63	1.85	1.71
6. I have learned independent research skills in my ELP classes.	1.60	1.77	1.66
7. The ELP program has taught me skills which allow me to see both sides of an issue.	2.01	2.15	2.07
8. I use what I have learned in my ELP class in everyday situations.	2.43	2.70	2.53
9. Being in an ELP class has given me greater self-confidence.	1.91	2.22	2.02*
10. I enjoy school more when I am in the ELP program.	1.82	2.22	1.97*
14. My teacher in the ELP class encourages me to create original ideas or products.	1.45	1.68	1.53
15. I have adequate opportunities to work independently in my ELP class.	1.73	1.91	1.79
17. I have been introduced to many different subjects in my ELP class.	1.56	1.81	1.66
23. The ELP program has allowed me to learn about the subjects in which I am particularly interested.	1.76	2.01	1.85
24. I have developed new interests as a result of being in the ELP program.	1.81	2.16	1.94*
25. The ELP program has helped me become aware of my capabilities.	1.84	1.98	1.89
26. The ELP program has helped me become aware of the needs of others.	2.38	2.58	2.45
27. The ELP program has helped me learn to communicate my ideas to other people.	2.04	2.14	2.08
28. I spend more time reading since I have been in the ELP program.	2.84	2.91	2.87

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of elementary and junior high students for elementary program.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Mean Responses to Likert Items on Teacher/Administrator Survey of Elementary Gifted Program

Item	Means**			
	Teach.	Prin.	ELP Teach.	Overall
PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS				
18. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	1.49	1.44	1.07	1.46
24. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment, or a combination of acceleration and enrichment.	2.88	3.58	3.29	2.99
28. The amount of time per week that gifted children spend in gifted classes is sufficient.	2.64	3.00	3.07	2.71
36. I feel that gifted children should complete any work that was missed while receiving gifted instruction.	3.46	4.12	4.50	3.60
37. I feel that gifted children should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while receiving gifted instruction.	2.31	1.84	1.43	2.20
50. In the regular class gifted children are allowed to progress through concepts as mastery is exhibited.	2.27	2.12	3.00	2.30
51. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	2.06	2.40	2.43	2.19*
52. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	2.41	2.44	2.43	2.42
PROGRAM PLACEMENT	Area Mean:			2.61
20. The criteria gifted children have to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	2.54	2.48	2.36	2.52
21. Gifted children are placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	2.55	2.54	1.93	2.51*
22. Parents are provided an adequate explanation of their child's test results for gifted placement.	2.54	2.08	2.86	2.51*
23. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	2.84	2.72	3.86	2.89*

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of teacher and administrator groups.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**			
Item	Teach.	Prin.	ELP Teach.	Overall
CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS	Area Mean:			2.43
19. The district goals and objectives for the Mesa Gifted Program have been shared with classroom teachers.	2.50	2.60	2.36	2.58
27. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	2.80	2.40	2.07	2.71*
32. There are too many students in the gifted class for adequate instruction.	3.27	3.88	2.07	3.26*
35. Principal demonstrates support for the gifted program.	2.06	1.76	1.86	2.01
38. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the regular class.	2.08	1.88	1.86	2.05
39. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted programs.	2.33	2.08	1.64	2.26
55. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	2.77	2.40	2.00	2.68*
COMMUNICATION	Area Mean:			2.38
31. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available for parent conferences.	2.38	1.96	1.14	2.26*
33. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep parents adequately informed of their child's progress.	2.59	2.20	2.21	2.52
34. Cooperation between regular classroom teachers and the teacher of the gifted is good.	2.34	2.60	2.08	2.35
FACILITIES	Area Mean:			2.82
25. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	2.96	3.40	2.85	3.00*
26. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	2.50	3.20	3.57	2.65*

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of teacher and administrator groups.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Item	Means**			
	Teach.	Prin.	ELP Teach.	Overall
PROGRAM BENEFITS	Area Mean:			2.38
29. Gifted children are exposed to a sufficient variety of subjects in gifted classes.	2.50	2.52	2.07	2.48
30. The gifted program adequately motivates gifted children.	2.59	2.52	1.92	2.54
40. The individual needs of gifted children are being met in the gifted program.	2.60	2.80	2.36	2.60*
41. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of their capabilities.	2.33	2.28	1.64	2.28
42. The gifted program helps the gifted child develop and/or maintain a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	2.33	2.12	1.50	2.25
43. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of the needs of others.	3.05	2.84	1.79	2.95*
44. The gifted program helps gifted children communicate their ideas.	2.33	2.20	1.36	2.25
45. The gifted program helps gifted children become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	2.19	2.00	1.15	2.10
46. The gifted program has provided opportunities for gifted children to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested.	2.11	2.12	1.29	2.06
47. The gifted program provides opportunities for gifted children to develop new interests.	2.04	1.96	1.21	1.98
48. Gifted children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	2.21	2.36	1.29	2.17*
49. Gifted children perform better in the regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	3.11	3.12	2.25	3.06*
53. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in gifted classes are relevant.	2.41	2.20	1.14	2.31*
54. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in regular classes are relevant.	2.24	2.44	2.43	2.28

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of teacher and administrator groups.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Mean Responses to Likert Items on Parent Survey of Elementary Gifted Program

Item	Means** Elementary Parent	Junior High Parent	Overall Parent
PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS			
14. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	1.34	1.42	1.37
21. I am satisfied with the procedure of providing gifted instruction to my child on a part-time basis.	2.39	2.57	2.46
22. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment.	2.56	2.61	2.58
26. The amount of time per week that my child spends in gifted classes is sufficient.	2.72	2.61	2.68
34. Regular class teachers expect my child to complete work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	2.59	2.37	2.50
35. I feel that my child should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	2.18	2.51	2.31*
36. I feel that my child should complete any work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	3.65	3.29	3.51*
52. In the regular class my child has been allowed to progress through concepts as he/she exhibits mastery.	2.48	2.57	2.52
53. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	2.21	2.25	2.23
54. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	2.54	2.33	2.45

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, response of parents of elementary and parents of junior high gifted students for the elementary program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**		
	Elementary Parent	Junior High Parent	Overall Parent
PROGRAM PLACEMENT	Area Mean:		2.50
15. I received adequate information on the criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program.	2.68	2.48	2.60
17. The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	2.13	2.11	2.12
18. My child was placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	2.28	2.32	2.30
19. I received an adequate explanation of my child's placement test results.	2.91	2.68	2.82
20. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	2.64	2.66	2.65
CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS	Area Mean:		2.23
16. The goals and objectives of the Mesa Gifted Program are clearly defined.	2.43	2.58	2.49
25. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	2.32	2.42	2.36
29. The teachers of classes for gifted children are qualified to teach gifted children.	1.84	2.32	2.03*
31. There are too many students in my child's gifted class for adequate instruction.	3.48	3.23	3.38*
37. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in his/her regular class.	1.78	1.83	1.80
38. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	1.85	1.81	1.83
56. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	2.55	2.31	2.45*
COMMUNICATION	Area Mean:		2.14
30. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available if I request a conference.	1.57	1.88	1.70*
32. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep me adequately informed on my child's progress.	2.23	2.55	2.36*
33. Cooperation between my child's gifted class teacher and regular class teachers seems to be good.	2.29	2.49	2.37

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, response of parents of elementary and parents of junior high gifted students for the elementary program.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**		
	Elementary Parent	Junior High Parent	Overall Parent
FACILITIES	Area Mean:		2.91
23. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	2.97	3.12	3.03
24. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	2.81	2.77	2.79
PROGRAM BENEFITS	Area Mean:		2.13
27. My child is exposed to a sufficient variety of subjects in gifted classes.	2.21	2.46	2.32
28. The gifted program adequately motivates my child.	2.11	2.46	2.25
39. My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	1.43	1.86	1.60*
40. I have been pleased with my child's experiences in the gifted program.	1.60	1.94	1.74
41. My child's individual needs are being met in the gifted program.	2.14	2.40	2.24
42. I can see positive changes in my child at home as a result of participation in gifted classes.	2.27	2.47	2.35
43. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of his/her capabilities.	2.07	2.21	2.13
44. The gifted program has helped my child develop and/or maintain a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	2.13	2.28	2.19
45. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of the needs of others.	2.65	2.74	2.68
46. The gifted program has helped my child communicate his/her ideas.	2.04	2.14	2.08
47. The gifted classes have helped my child become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	1.89	2.02	1.95
48. The gifted program has provided opportunities for my child to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which he/she is particularly skilled and/or interested.	2.09	2.23	2.15

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, response of parents of elementary and parents of junior high gifted students for the elementary program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**		
	Elementary Parent	Junior High Parent	Overall Parent
PROGRAM BENEFITS (cont.)			
49. The gifted program has provided the opportunities for my child to develop new interests.	1.83	2.08	1.93*
50. My child is intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	1.83	2.01	1.90*
51. My child performs better in his/her regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	2.50	2.56	2.53
55. The enrichment activities provided my child in gifted classes are relevant.	2.02	2.15	2.07

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, response of parents of elementary and parents of junior high gifted students for the elementary program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Mean Responses to Likert Items on Student Survey of Junior High Gifted Programs

Item	Means** Junior High Student	High School Student	Overall
PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS			
11. I am treated more favorably by other students because I am in the gifted program.	3.65	3.52	3.59
12. I wish I could spend more time in the gifted class.	2.90	2.63	2.76*
13. I am treated more favorably by my regular classroom teachers because I am in the gifted program.	3.15	3.08	3.11
19. I am able to keep up with assignments in my regular classes.	1.94	1.95	1.95
27. The type of program for elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same.	3.24	3.39	3.31
CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS	Area Mean:		2.41
16. The grading procedures used by my gifted classroom teacher are fair.	2.21	2.18	2.20
18. There are too many students in the gifted classes for adequate instruction.	3.28	3.66	3.47*
26. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	2.58	2.39	2.49
PROGRAM BENEFITS	Area Mean:		2.29
4. The activities in my gifted class are challenging to me.	2.14	1.94	2.04
5. The gifted program has helped me become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	2.16	1.91	2.03
6. I have learned independent research skills in my gifted class.	2.09	1.97	2.03
7. The gifted program has taught me skills which allow me to analyze both sides of an issue.	2.08	2.09	2.09

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of junior high and high school students for junior high program.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**		
Item	Junior High Student	High School Student	Overall
PROGRAM BENEFITS (cont.)			
8. I have learned how to apply knowledge to practical situations in my gifted class.	2.23	2.10	2.16
9. Being in a gifted class has given me greater self-confidence.	2.52	2.29	2.40
10. I enjoy school more when I am in the gifted program.	2.57	2.42	2.50
14. My teacher in the gifted class encourages me to create original ideas or products.	1.96	1.92	1.94
15. I have adequate opportunities to work independently in my gifted class.	2.04	1.97	2.00
17. I have been exposed to a wide variety of subjects in my gifted class.	2.15	2.12	2.14
20. The gifted program has allowed me to pursue the subjects in which I am particularly interested.	2.87	2.59	2.73
21. I have developed new interests as a result of being in the gifted program.	2.63	2.29	2.46*
22. The gifted program has helped me become aware of my capabilities.	2.17	1.97	2.07
23. The gifted program has helped me become aware of the needs of others.	2.81	2.76	2.79
24. The gifted program has helped me learn to communicate my ideas to other people.	2.32	2.23	2.28
25. I spend more time reading since I have been in the gifted program.	3.04	2.90	2.97

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of junior high and high school students for junior high program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Mean Responses to Likert Items on Parent Survey of Junior High Gifted Program

	Means**		
	Junior High Parent	High School Parent	Overall Parent
PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS			
14. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	1.43	1.58	1.50
21. I am satisfied with the procedure of providing gifted instruction to my child on a part-time basis.	2.66	2.65	2.66
22. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment.	2.55	2.47	2.51
26. The amount of time per week that my child spends in gifted classes is sufficient.	2.47	2.53	2.50
35. I feel that my child should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	2.59	2.74	2.66
36. I feel that my child should complete any work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	3.08	2.78	2.94
52. In the regular class my child has been allowed to progress through concepts as he/she exhibits mastery.	2.83	2.68	2.77
53. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	2.15	2.07	2.11
54. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	2.01	1.95	1.98

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of parents of junior high students and parents of high school students for junior high program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**		
	Junior High Parent	High School Parent	Overall Parent
PROGRAM PLACEMENT	Area Mean:		2.63
15. I received adequate information on the criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program.	2.69	3.15	2.90
17. The criteria my child had to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	2.13	2.33	2.22
18. My child was placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	2.31	2.54	2.41*
19. I received an adequate explanation of my child's placement test results.	2.84	3.06	2.94
20. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	2.60	2.84	2.70
CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS	Area Mean:		2.48
16. The goals and objectives of the Mesa Gifted Programs are clearly defined.	2.78	3.07	2.91
25. The grading procedure used in the gifted classes is adequate.	2.38	2.51	2.44
29. The teachers of classes for gifted children are qualified to teach gifted children.	2.41	2.59	2.49
31. There are too many students in my child's gifted class for adequate instruction.	3.31	3.39	3.35
34. Regular class teachers expect my child to complete work that was missed while he/she was receiving gifted instruction.	2.53	2.55	2.54
37. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in his/her regular class.	1.82	1.89	1.85
38. My child is able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	1.80	1.94	1.80
56. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	2.47	2.45	2.46

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of parents of junior high students and parents of high school students for junior high program.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**		
	Junior High Parent	High School Parent	Overall Parent
COMMUNICATION	Area Mean:		2.46
30. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available if I request a conference.	1.99	2.29	2.13
32. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep me adequately informed of my child's progress.	2.63	2.89	2.75
33. Cooperation between by child's gifted class teacher and regular class teachers seems to be good.	2.42	2.57	2.49
FACILITIES	Area Mean:		2.92
23. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	2.86	3.00	2.92
24. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	2.91	2.92	2.92
PROGRAM BENEFITS	Area Mean:		2.26
27. My child is exposed to a sufficient variety of subjects in gifted classes.	2.57	2.71	2.63
28. The gifted program adequately motivates my child.	2.39	2.52	2.45
39. My child enjoys being in the gifted program.	1.70	1.91	1.80
40. I have been pleased with my child's experiences in the gifted program.	1.86	2.04	1.94
41. My child's individual needs are being met in the gifted program.	2.40	2.47	2.43
42. I can see positive changes in my child at home as a result of participation in gifted classes.	2.49	2.61	2.54
43. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of his/her capabilities.	2.02	2.23	2.11
44. The gifted program has helped my child develop and/or maintian a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	2.09	2.25	2.16*
45. The gifted program has helped my child become aware of the needs of others.	2.61	2.70	2.65

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of parents of junior high students and parents of high school students for junior high program.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	Means**		
	Junior High Parent	High School Parent	Overall Parent
PROGRAM BENEFITS (Cont.)			
46. The gifted program has helped my child communicate his/her ideas.	2.03	2.24	2.12*
47. The gifted classes have helped my child become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	2.01	2.14	2.07*
48. The gifted program has provided opportunities for my child to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which he/she is particularly skilled and/or interested.	2.28	2.21	2.25
49. The gifted program has provided the opportunities for my child to develop new interests.	2.17	2.36	2.26
50. My child is intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	2.06	2.04	2.05
51. My child performs better in his/her regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	2.41	2.43	2.42
55. The enrichment activities provided my child in the gifted classes are relevant.	2.25	2.30	2.27

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of parents of junior high students and parents of high school students for junior high program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Mean Responses to *Likert Items and Teacher/Administrator* Survey of Junior High Gifted Program

Item	J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	J. H. ELP Teach.	Overall
	MEANS**				
PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS					
18. Gifted children need services/programs beyond regular curriculum to achieve their potential.	1.61	1.58	1.30	1.00	1.54
24. The type of program for the elementary, junior high, and high school gifted students should be the same, e.g., acceleration or enrichment, or a combination of acceleration and enrichment.	3.08	3.17	3.20	2.42	3.05
28. The amount of time per week that gifted children spend in gifted classes is sufficient.	2.88	2.58	3.00	2.91	2.87
36. I feel that gifted children should complete any work that was missed while receiving gifted instruction.	2.45	3.92	3.60	3.33	2.69*
37. I feel that gifted children should be responsible only for non-mastered concepts missed while receiving gifted instruction.	3.03	2.58	2.40	2.00	2.89
50. In the regular class gifted children are allowed to progress through concepts as mastery is exhibited.	2.89	3.09	2.70	3.33	2.93
51. A student should demonstrate grade level mastery in the "basic" subjects prior to being allowed to participate in the gifted program.	1.95	3.09	2.20	2.42	2.08
52. A child who is gifted in only one or two areas should be serviced by the gifted program in those areas.	2.09	2.36	1.80	1.42	2.04
	Area Mean:				2.76
PROGRAM PLACEMENT					
20. The criteria gifted children have to meet to qualify for the gifted program are reasonable.	2.75	1.83	2.20	2.67	2.64*
21. Gifted children are placed in the gifted program within 60 days of identification.	2.85	2.25	2.80	2.58	2.78*

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of teacher and administrator groups for junior high program.

**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

	MEANS**				
Item	J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	J. H. ELP Teach.	Overall
PROGRAM PLACEMENT (cont.)					
22. Parents are provided an adequate explanation of their child's test results for gifted placement.	2.74	2.17	2.70	2.92	2.71*
23. Testing services for placement in the gifted program are adequate.	2.92	2.75	2.60	3.50	2.93*
CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS	Area Mean:				2.83
19. The district goals and objectives for the Mesa Gifted Program have been shared with classroom teachers.	3.71	2.75	2.40	3.42	3.54*
32. There are too many students in the gifted class for adequate instruction.	3.15	3.58	3.20	2.36	3.13*
35. Principal demonstrates support for the gifted program.	2.42	1.50	2.40	2.33	2.35*
39. Most gifted children are able to "keep up" with assignments in the gifted program.	2.44	1.83	2.40	1.92	2.36*
55. Elementary students in the gifted program are academically prepared to enter the junior high gifted program.	2.99	3.73	2.22	3.17	3.01*
COMMUNICATION	Area Mean:				2.64
31. The teachers of classes for gifted children are readily available for parent conferences.	2.52	1.67	1.90	2.00	2.38*
33. Teachers of classes for gifted children keep parents adequately informed of their child's progress.	2.76	1.83	2.80	2.42	2.67*
34. Cooperation between regular classroom teachers and the teacher of the gifted is good.	2.98	2.08	2.80	2.58	2.87*

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of teacher and administrator groups for junior high program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Item	MEANS** J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	J. H. ELP Teach.	Overal
FACILITIES	Area Mean:				3.06
25. Gifted instructional facilities are adequate.	3.11	2.58	2.70	4.17	3.12*
26. Transportation provided for the gifted program is adequate.	2.99	2.33	2.90	3.92	3.01*
PROGRAM BENEFITS	Area Mean:				2.63
29. Gifted children are exposed to a sufficient variety of subjects in gifted classes.	2.93	2.58	2.80	3.00	2.90
30. The gifted program adequately motivates gifted children.	2.89	2.42	2.70	2.55	2.82
40. The individual needs of gifted children are being met in the gifted program.	2.93	2.83	3.00	3.09	2.94
41. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of their capabilities.	2.57	1.73	2.00	1.92	2.43*
42. The gifted program helps the gifted child develop and/or maintain a positive perception of himself/herself as a person.	2.60	1.73	2.20	1.83	2.46
43. The gifted program helps gifted children become aware of the needs of others.	3.18	3.00	2.70	3.00	3.13*
44. The gifted program helps gifted children communicate their ideas.	2.55	1.64	1.80	1.75	2.38*
45. The gifted program helps gifted children become more proficient in problem solving and critical thinking.	2.48	1.73	1.90	1.83	2.35
46. The gifted program has provided opportunities for gifted children to pursue in greater depth the subjects in which they are particularly skilled and/or interested.	2.55	2.18	2.20	1.82	2.45
47. The gifted program provides opportunities for gifted children to develop new interests.	2.49	2.00	1.80	1.64	2.36*

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of teacher and administrator groups for junior high program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

Item	MEANS**				
	J. H. Teach.	J. H. Princ.	H. S. Princ.	J. H. ELP Teach.	Overall
PROGRAM BENEFITS (cont.)					
48. Gifted children are intellectually challenged in the gifted classroom.	2.61	1.73	2.00	1.67	2.44*
49. Gifted children perform better in the regular classes as a result of participation in the gifted program.	3.00	3.18	2.30	2.17	2.91*
53. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in gifted classes are relevant.	2.69	2.00	2.40	2.08	2.58*
54. The enrichment activities provided gifted children in regular classes are relevant.	2.65	2.82	2.40	3.17	2.69

*Significant difference, based on Chi-square, in response of teacher and administrator groups for junior high program.
**1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX D

Summary of Open Comments

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM
PARENTS OF ELEMENTARY STUDENTS

Comments	Number
Positive toward program	55
Better communication with parents and teachers	45
More field trips	23
More computer literacy	22
Broaden scope of subjects offered	21
Concern for budget	19
Improve transportation	17
Accelerate basics	16
More coordination between ELP and classroom teachers	16
Increase time in gifted	16
More parental involvement	15
Prefer 5 full days of ELP	13
Acceleration in literature	12
Transition problem between elementary and junior high	12
Instruction geared to child's special abilities	11
More foreign language	10
Program not challenging	10
More support from administration and Board	10
Should serve more children	9
More math	9
Have in child's own school - less busing	8
More independent study groups	8
Concern for "elitist" attitude	8
More emphasis on thinking skills	8
Need central pool from which to order materials, speakers, trips, etc.	8

Comments (Parents of Elementary - Continued)	Number
Need more physical facilities for gifted	7
ELP in kindergarten	7
Acceleration in science, math and English	7
Don't segregate gifted students	6
More research	6
Combine ELP and ALP	6
Continue enrichment activities and inform parents	6

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM
PARENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS

Comments	Number
Broaden scope of subjects offered (science, foreign language, computer, typing)	39
Positive toward program	32
Preparation for transition was adequate	31
Better communication between teachers and parents	22
Need better transition between elementary and junior high	20
Smaller classes	17
Better quality teachers	16
More field trips	16
Improve testing and placement	14
Too much homework	13
Need more electives (after school or before school programs)	11
Need more time in program	9
Need acceleration and enrichment	9
Need more funds	8

Comments (Parents of Junior High - Con't.)	Number
More individual instruction	7
Need better academic curriculum	6
Offer subjects on career interests	6

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM
PRINCIPALS

Comments	Number
Expand program so all identified students are served	5
Provide space at each school	4
Need better communication in district	3
Need more teachers	3
Put one knowledgeable person in charge	2
Monitor program more closely	2

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM
TEACHERS OF THE GIFTED

Comments	Number
Need more supplies and equipment	9
Improve testing and screening of students	8
Have smaller classes	5
Need more teachers	5
Need more time in program	5

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

Comments	Number
Need better communication with classroom teachers and parents; ELP teachers and classroom teachers	68
Reform the testing procedure	27
Should complete regular classroom work before going to a gifted class	10
ELP students should share more with regular classroom	9
More time needed in elementary - one day a week is inadequate	8
Provide more enrichment type activities	8

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM
ELEMENTARY STUDENTS

Comments	Number
Positive toward program and teacher	148
Want more time in program	97
Like the independent studies	67
Like the computers	42
Like the activities	32
Like science	31
Like the challenge	29
Offer more thinklab and logic	19
Like field trips	19
Offer variety of subjects according to students' interests	16
Get more computers	14
Like to be with friends	12
Like research	12

Comments (Elementary students - con't)	Number
Should be at own school	12
Like the experiments	11
Not challenging enough	10
Like typing	9
Too much time wasted busing students	9
More field trips	9
Like playing games	9
Shorter time	8
Like to go at own pace	8
Like reports	7
Too many reports	7
Too much thinklab and work	6

ELEMENTARY PROGRAM
JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS

Comments	Number
Positive toward program	112
Likes field trips	25
Need more time in the program	23
Smaller classes	21
Like independent studies	21
Want less homework	19
Want more variety of subjects according to interest	19
Like teachers	19
More field trips	14
Like to be able to express own ideas	13
Like the freedom	11

Comments (Junior High students - con't)	Number
Like association with students with similar IQ	10
Would like to have at own school	8
Teachers expect too much	7
Offer more on individual basis	7
Like creative projects	7
Make it a little more challenging	7
Like to work at own pace	7
Like the individual help	7
Rotate teachers	7

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM
PARENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS

Comments	Number
Offer more variety of subjects - better curriculum - (typing, computer, outside reading, current events, and foreign language)	27
Better communication needed between teachers and parents; ELP teachers and classroom teachers	24
Positive toward program	19
Transition was satisfactory between elementary and junior high	17
Need better placement and testing	14
Need better transition between elementary and junior high	13
Give high school or college credit where earned	12
Need better qualified teachers	11
Need more challenging in junior high	10
More field trips	8
Elementary level is enriching	6
Need smaller classes	6

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM
PARENTS OF SENIOR HIGH STUDENTS

Need better communication between parents and teachers	47
Need better qualified teachers	30
Positive toward program	21
Need continuity between elementary and junior high	20
Review entrance criteria	20
Need exposure to enrichment program (arts, music, classics)	14
Transition preparation between elementary and junior high is adequate	13

Comments (Parents of Senior High - Con't)	Number
Give student recognition for work performed	12
Junior high program is inadequate	11
Offer more individual help	11
Offer more meaningful classes at high school level	8
Make more classes available	8
Student should know "basic" skills before being in gifted	8
Offer college level courses	8
Elementary need more homework to prepare for junior high	8
Junior high program too dependent on individual teachers	8
Have smaller classes	7
Give opportunities to select classes by qualification rather than year in school	6
Need more funds for material, etc.	6
Too much required from students	6

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM
JUNIOR HIGH AND SENIOR HIGH PRINCIPALS

More funds needed	4
Expand junior high program	3
Should have district supported staffing	3
Need better screening and testing program	3
Need more meetings (on school time) for all ELP teachers	3
Develop curriculum (in print) and follow it	2
Institute K-12 gifted program	2
Smaller classes	2

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM
TEACHERS OF THE GIFTED

Comments	Number
Testing and placement should be the same throughout the district	3
Need strong in-service teacher training	3
Need more funds for equipment, books, and field trips	3
Should have district sponsored field trips	2
Need more resources available	2

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM
JUNIOR HIGH TEACHERS

Comments	Number
Need better communication between teachers of the gifted and regular classroom teachers	30
Limit entrance requirements to those able and ambitious - consider social and emotional growth	11
Need more in-service for gifted teachers	7
Need more field trips	6
Increase subjects offered according to students' interests	5

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM
JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS

Comments	Number
Gifted classes are challenging	56
Positive toward program	27
Like association with students on same level	26
Need smaller classes	23
Offer more activities and subjects on individual interests	20
Like teacher attention	16

Comments (Junior High Students - con't.)	Number
Have less homework	14
Like discussions	13
Like working independently	13
Change the grading system	10
Enjoy creative writing	10
Change teachers	10
Need more independent studies	8
Like different areas of social studies, etc.	7
Like field trips	7
Like variety of subjects offered	6
Enjoy the freedom - individuality	6
Teachers expect too much	6
Explain things better	6

JUNIOR HIGH PROGRAM
SENIOR HIGH STUDENTS

Comments	Number
Gifted classes are challenging	65
Positive toward program	49
Like working individually and making own decisions	33
Like association with students on same level	26
Need wider range of subjects	20
Like exposure to new concepts and ideas	15
Need stricter teacher requirements	14
Like variety of assignments	11
Need smaller classes	9
Change teachers	9

Comments (Senior High Students - con't.)	Number
Like the freedom	9
Like individual instruction if needed	8
Teachers are more interesting	8
Not enough individual work	7
Need to explore individual interests	7
Like class discussions	6
Better grading scale needed	6
Too many projects and assignments at the same time (too much pressure)	6
Teacher expectations too high	6
Expand the time reserved for program	6